BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition by AT&T Communications of the Southern) Docket No. 960846-TP States, Inc., MCI Telecommunications Corporation, MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc., American Communications Services, Inc. and American Communications Services of Jacksonville, 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. 960833-TP) Docket No. 960916-TP

PROCEEDINGS:

PREHEARING CONFERENCE

BEFORE:

COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON

Prehearing Officer

DATE:

Thursday, October 3, 1996

TIME:

Commenced at 9:07 a.m. Concluded at 10:55 p.m.

PLACE:

Betty Easley Conference Center

Room 148

4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY:

LISA GIROD JONES, RMR, RPR

W. Paul Rayborn and Associates

P.O. BOX 10195

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32302-2195

(904) 224-7642

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

10653 OCT-78

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING 60

APPEARANCES:

TRACY HATCH, Attorney, and MICHAEL W. TYE, Attorney, AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., 101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700, Tallahassee, Florida 32301; appearing on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

RICHARD D. MELSON, Attorney at Law, Hopping, Green, Sams & Smith, 215 South Calhoun Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301; appearing on behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc.

NANCY B. WHITE, General Attorney, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., 675 West Peachtree Street, Suite 4300, Atlanta, Georgia 30375-0001; appearing on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

NORMAN H. HORTON, JR., Attorney at Law, and FLOYD R. SELF, Attorney at Law, Messer, Caparello, Madsen, Goldman & Metz, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701, Tallahassee, Florida 32301; appearing on behalf of American Communications Services, Inc.

JAMES FALVEY, Esquire, 131 National Business Parkway, Suite 100, Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701; appearing on behalf of American Communications Services, Inc.

MARK HERRON, Attorney at Law, and E. GARY EARLY, Attorney at Law, Akerman, Senterfitt & Eidson, P.A., 216 South Monroe Street, Suite 200, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1859; appearing on behalf of BellSouth Advertising & Publishing Company.

DONNA CANZANO, MONICA M. BARONE, CHARLIE PELLEGRINI, LORNA WAGNER and BETH CULPEPPER, Staff Counsel, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0863; appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

DEPOSITION

_ _

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Call the prehearing conference to order. Could we have the notice read, please?

MS. CANZANO: Pursuant to notice issued

September 12th, a prehearing conference has been set for
this time and this place in Docket Nos. 960833, 960846
and 960916-TP.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Take appearances.

MS. WHITE: Yes, Nancy White for BellSouth Telecommunications Company, 675 West Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375.

MR. MELSON: Richard Melson, of the law firm Hopping, Green, Sams and Smith, P.A., P. O. Box 6526, Tallahassee, appearing on behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. Appearing with me at the hearing will be Martha McMillin of MCI in Atlanta.

MR. HATCH: Tracy Hatch, 101 North Monroe

Street, Tallahassee, Florida, Suite 700, appearing on
behalf of AT&T. Also appearing with me momentarily, I
hope, is Mr. Michael W. Tye.

MR. HORTON: Norman H. Horton, Jr. and Floyd R. Self, Messer, Caparello, Madsen, Goldman and Metz, P. O. Box 1876, Tallahassee, on behalf of ACSI.

Also Mr. James C. Falvey of ACSI, 131 National 1 Business Parkway, Suite 100, Annapolis Junction, 2 3 Maryland 20701. Mr. Falvey is a member of the Bar and has participated in proceedings before this Commission before. 5 6 Appearing at the hearing will be Mr. Brad E. 7 Mutschelknaus -- I'll give you the spelling -- of Kelly, 8 Drye & Warren, L.L.P., 1200 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 9 10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you. 11 MR. HERRON: Mark Herron on behalf of 12 BellSouth Advertising & Publishing Company with the law 13 firm Akerman, Senterfitt & Eidson here in Tallahassee, Florida. Also here today is Gary Early of Akerman, 14 Senterfitt as well. 15 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry, I'm confused. I didn't know you were a party to this 17 proceeding. 18 19 MR. HERRON: I'm not, but in case you want to 20 address any BAPCO issues, we have made a filing in the 21 file, in case you want to address any of those issues. 22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: You need to repeat your 23 name again, please, and spell it.

MR. HERRON: Mark Herron, H-E-R-R-O-N, on

behalf of BellSouth Advertising & Publishing Company, of

24

| - | one far film interment, beneeffile a farbon nere in |
|------------|---|
| 2 | Tallahassee. |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: And you mentioned |
| 4 | another name as well? |
| 5 | MR. HERRON: Also here is Gary Early of |
| 6 | Akerman, Senterfitt as well. |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: E-A-R-L-Y? |
| 8 | MR. HERRON: Yes, sir. |
| 9 | MS. CANZANO: And I'm Donna Canzano, and |
| LO | appearing with me is Charlie Pellegrini, Monica Barone, |
| l1 | Beth Culpepper and Lorna Wagner, appearing on behalf of |
| L2 | the Commission Staff. |
| L3 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Could you give me |
| L 4 | everyone that's are all those attorneys from Staff |
| L5 | going to be here today? |
| L6 | MS. CANZANO: Yes, we're here. We've divided |
| L7 | up different responsibilities in this case. |
| L8 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Go through those names |
| .9 | again, please. |
| 20 | MS. CANZANO: Me, Donna Canzano, Charlie |
| 21 | Pellegrini, Monica Barone, Beth Culpepper and Lorna |
| 2 | Wagner. |
| :3 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Do we have any |
| 4 | preliminary matters? |
| ا ج | MS CANTANO: We have a number of matters |

One is preliminary, and Mr. Pellegrini will handle 2 that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PELLEGRINI: Commissioner Deason, there's the pending matter of disputed issues in the MCI BellSouth docket, 960846. Staff recommends that Issues 8, 9, 22, 24 and 27 be excluded from this proceeding in the belief that they have been negotiated in the interim or partial agreement of 5-15-96 approved by this Commission on 8-13-96.

Staff further recommends that Issues 29, 25, 26 and 30 are appropriate or arbitratable issues in this proceeding. Issue 29 appears not to have been negotiated in the partial agreement.

And Issues 25, 26 and 30 are not to be precluded, in Staff's belief, from negotiation and arbitration merely because they may be more appropriately addressed in the generic proceeding.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Melson, are you withdrawing any of these issues at this time?

MR. MELSON: Let me double check, Issue 29 MCI will withdraw. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well.

MR. MELSON: But the other issues we do not.

MS. CANZANO: And Staff would just like to

clarify. Mr. Melson, are you withdrawing that from your 25

petition? 1 2 MR. MELSON: Yes. MS. CANZANO: Thank you. 3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Was it contemplated that 4 we would have oral argument on this matter, or have we 5 already had a full round of filings in this? 6 The parties have filed letters 7 MS. CANZANO: addressing this issue, but it would be up to your 8 discretion whether or not you want to listen to oral argument on this. 10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm prepared to rule on 11 it and put the parties on notice that Issues 8, 9, 22, 13 24 and 27 will not be part of this proceeding. Issues 25, 26 and 30 shall. And there will be an order that 15 will be -- actually this will be incorporated into the prehearing order that comes out of this proceeding. MS. CANZANO: And that would be as those 17 issues relate to MCI, correct? 18 COMMISSIONER DEASON: As they relate to MCI. 19 20 It's my understanding they only pertain to MCI; is that correct? 21 22 MR. PELLEGRINI: That's correct. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. 23 MS. WHITE: I apologize, Commissioner Deason. 24

Could you repeat those numbers again?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Issues 8, 9, 22, 24 and 27 will not be part of this arbitration proceeding.

Issue 29 has been withdrawn. Issues 25, 26 and 30 shall be part of this arbitration proceeding.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes.

MR. MELSON: That ruling is going to be incorporated into the prehearing order?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's correct.

MR. MELSON: It is likely our intention to seek review of that ruling by the full Commission, and we will make an appropriate filing as soon as the order has been issued.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I would encourage you to do that as quickly as possible. In fact, you may want to do it even before the prehearing order is issued, since you know what the ruling is.

MR. MELSON: All right, thank you.

MR. PELLEGRINI: Commissioner Deason, there's an additional preliminary matter, that is the matter of BAPCO's notice of request for clarification of issue preclusion, or in the alternative, notice of substantial interest, which was filed on 9-11-96 and its supplemental filing on 10-2-96. BAPCO seeks clarification of the procedural orders in this

proceeding and confirmation that BAPCO is not bound by the Commission's rulings in these proceedings concerning directory publication matters. It is Staff's belief that BAPCO's concerns are adequately addressed by the procedural orders in these dockets. For example, Order No. PSC-96-0933, Page 2, paragraph 2, which state that only the party requesting interconnection and the incumbent local exchange company shall be parties to the arbitration proceeding and bound, therefore, by the agreement to result from said proceeding.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Is it contemplated that this issue would be addressed today, or is the -- do we already have adequate pleading basis to make a decision?

MR. PELLEGRINI: Well, we merely have BAPCO's notice at this point, but yes, I wanted to raise the issue so that you could determine whether or not you wished to address it in this proceeding.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'll give the parties an opportunity to address this, including BAPCO, briefly this morning before I make a ruling.

MR. HERRON: Commissioner Deason, Mark Herron on behalf of BellSouth Advertising & Publishing Company. I'm not going to rehash in any great detail what was set forth in our notice, in our pleading, but

our points are basically twofold. One is that the directory issues relating to the branding of the directory that we would publish for -- in this case now it's AT&T, because I believe the MCI issues have been withdrawn as a result of the previous order -- are not subject to arbitration under the federal provisions to Section 251, 252. The issues clearly set forth in that federal law relate to interconnection, unbundling and resale. Publishing of a directory is not one of those issues.

There is no -- and again, the pertinent question that needs to be asked and addressed by the Commission, by the Commission Staff, is where in Section 251 are directory issues made a proper subject for arbitration? It's not there. Arbitration --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, let me ask you, if it's not subject to arbitration, well then we're not going to arbitrate it, and why are you here?

MR. HERRON: Well, I believe it says that

Issue 23, in the listing of issues here, talks about
should BellSouth be required to allow AT&T and MCI to
have an appearance, logo or name on the cover of the
white and yellow page directories? The parties that
brought the arbitration to you have listed it in their
petition. We have -- believe that it's not a proper

subject for arbitration and that's why we're here asking for that kind of clarification from you and the Commission.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, I need to know the basis of your position that you need to intervene in this -- and your standing to intervene in this proceeding.

MR. HERRON: We are asking not to intervene as a party. We are asking for clarification that this issue is not subject to arbitration in this proceeding. This federal law sets forth, in our belief, specific subjects which are required to be arbitrated. This is not one of them. This is a matter subject to negotiation between BAPCO and AT&T and MCI. BellSouth Telecommunications is not the real party in interest here to negotiate that issue or to have that issue arbitrated.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. Sims, do you care to provide any additional information?

MS. WHITE: I didn't hear you.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do you care to make any presentation on this question?

MS. WHITE: No, no, I don't. Well, I would agree that BellSouth Telecommunications does not have the authority to agree with the parties requesting this

matter. That's a matter for BAPCO, and BAPCO has been negotiating directly with MCI and AT&T, and BellSouth Telecommunications has not been a party to those negotiations on the directory issues.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Hatch.

MR. HATCH: Yes, sir, Commissioner Deason.

While on one hand, in a pure, strict, legal, structural sense, BAPCO isn't technically, or may not technically be a phone company -- we're not ready to concede that -- but even assuming that, arguendo, it is certainly an affiliate of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. by virtue of its having a common parent in BellSouth Corp. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., has, by directive of the Commission pursuant to the Commission's rules, the obligation to publish and provide directories. It is no accident that BellSouth's name appears on the cover of that directory. BellSouth, or BAPCO, exists principally to fulfill that function for BellSouth
Telecommunications, Inc.

And so while there is a technical corporate structural separation, they have a common parent and they are clearly affiliates, and it is unlikely that BAPCO could ever take a position inconsistent or at odds with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. While we have cut a partial agreement with respect to BAPCO in terms

of the call guide pages and so forth, the cover of the directory issue itself remains an issue with us.

With respect to Mr. Herron's argument that it doesn't come within the scope of the act, basically our argument is, is it falls within the parity requirements that BellSouth be required to provide all of those services to the extent that it provides them to other carriers the same way that it provides it to itself. And if BellSouth's name is going to be on that directory, then so should AT&T's and MCI's.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Horton, do you have anything to -- not your issue, right?

MR. HORTON: Not our issue.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I thought you had already -- this is not an issue for MCI.

MR. MELSON: The directory issue, No. 24, was excluded. The issue regarding the directory cover,
Issue 23, was not. I would adopt what Mr. Match said.
I would additionally point out that the Commission does have jurisdiction over BellSouth in this proceeding. We believe it is a proper subject for arbitration. And while the Commission may not be able to bind BAPCO directly, I believe you could craft an appropriate order directed to BellSouth that would achieve what we are seeking, which is the ability to have the logo on the

cover, to the same extent that BellSouth's appears on the cover.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Herron, do you have any concluding remarks?

MR. HERRON: Yes, sir. With respect to the issue of a common parent, we do not have a common parent. BellSouth Advertising & Publishing Company's parent is BellSouth Enterprises, Inc. and not BellSouth Telecommunications. And the common parent of BellSouth Telecommunications is not BellSouth Enterprises Group.

With respect to the issue of whether this is an arbitratable issue or not, the supplemental authority that we filed yesterday with the Commission, we filed orders from the Georgia PSC in a proceeding similar to this, prehearing order, where it was also determined that this was not an arbitratable issue under the Federal Act, and we recommend your review of that prior to making a ruling.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, final thoughts?

MR. PELLEGRINI: Well, Staff would continue to rely on the procedural order which binds only the parties to the negotiation to its rulings in this proceeding.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm not going to deviate from the prehearing order. I think it's clear on its

face that only the parties which are in the status of arbitration are parties to this proceeding. I'm going to maintain that as such.

As to the question of whether this is an issue which is subject to arbitration, I think that issue can adequately be addressed by the parties as they exist now, and I think the prehearing order is already clear that BAPCO and other parties are not bound by the decisions in this proceeding. Therefore I would agree with Staff's recommendation, and that is the ruling that I am making at this time.

Other preliminary matters?

MS. CANZANO: I would just like to go back to the discussion about the issues earlier that we've -- that you have excluded MCI. AT&T is covered for Issues 8, 9 and 22. AT&T took positions on those issues, so I would just like to point out that those issues should relate to AT&T only.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: 8, 9 and 22 are still subject to arbitration as they relate to AT&T?

MS. CANZANO: That's my understanding.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: But in this, since these issues are addressed by the agreement pertaining to MCI, 8, 9 and 22 would only be applicable to AT&T?

MS. CANZANO: Right. And what I can do is

move them to the section of the prehearing order that relates only to AT&T and BellSouth.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Other preliminary matters?

MS. CANZANO: None that I'm aware of.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Parties have any preliminary matters?

MS. WHITE: Well, I have a couple issues to bring up about the hearings themselves, but I don't know whether you want to discuss that now or wait until after we go through the prehearing statement.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, it may help us when we go through the order. So if you will bring it up now, that will be fine.

MS. WHITE: And I was just trying to think of things. I know that we have a lot of witnesses and a lot of testimony to get through in three days of hearings. So I was trying to think of some ways that would -- or might help move the hearing along. And one thing I came up with was a time limit on witness summaries, the summaries that the witnesses usually give when their testimony has been entered into the record and before they're available for cross-examination. I wanted to suggest that maybe a time limit be put on those summaries. I don't have anything -- any time

specific in mind, maybe ten minutes.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do you have any other preliminary matters?

MS. WHITE: I did want some clarification on the cross-examination. From the order of consolidation, I want to make sure that I know -- understand what it means about which parties can participate fully and how. I'm taking the order on consolidation as a three -- the three guidelines that you set forth in that order to be that all parties can cross-examine BellSouth witnesses on the common issues, but if the parties are in agreement on an issue, they can't cross each other's witness on that issue. And I guess what I'm looking for is an indication of whether that's a -- I'm right or wrong in that belief.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Other preliminary matters?

MS. WHITE: I wanted to put forth the suggestion on whether the parties or the commissioner thought whether opening statements of a specific time period would be of any assistance. And again, I did not have a time frame in mind, maybe X number of minutes on the common areas for each side, and then if a party has specific non-common areas, they would get a time frame in which to make an opening statement on that, and

BellSouth would get an equal time frame to reply. But again, that's just a suggestion. I'm not insisting on opening statements, just putting it forth.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.

MS. WHITE: And the last thing is with regard to a CD-ROM that AT&T, I believe, wants to use in the hearing. I'm not sure exactly how they want to use it, so we may have to have a discussion on this, and maybe if there's going to be a break, I could talk to Tracy about this and maybe get my concerns responded to then.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, I would encourage you to whatever anybody can talk about off the record and get worked out, certainly I encourage that. And if you think that's possibility, we won't even address it at this time.

MS. WHITE: I guess what I'm concerned about is I would like to know how they plan to use it, with what witness and whether they're putting it forward as substantive evidence or demonstrative evidence, in other words merely using it to illustrate --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: We'll take a break at some point and I encourage you to talk to counsel for AT&T, and if you have any concerns after that discussion, I'll give you an opportunity to bring that up.

MS. WHITE: Thank you. I think that's about it.

MS. CANZANO: I would like to raise one other -- and this might be appropriate to raise in that section -- and that would be the possibility of combining direct and rebuttal testimony in an effort to save some time.

MS. WHITE: You're right, that was the most basic one, I forgot, and yes, BellSouth has no problem with that if everyone else agrees.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Mr. Melson, do you have any comments on the suggestions that have been made thus far by BellSouth?

MR. MELSON: MCI has got no problem with a reasonable time limit on summaries.

With regard to cross-examination of non-Bell witnesses on common issues, there are some common issues where our position does not lay down with AT&T, and I believe that since we are both going to be bound by a single decision in this proceeding, I had understood that I would have the latitude to cross-examine AT&T witnesses as appropriate in those areas.

Opening statements, we're certainly willing to make one, if the Commission believes that would be helpful, and we will, if any other party does.

Combining direct and rebuttal, my personal preference is to keep them separate, but recognizing the severe time constraints we're under in this proceeding, we would not object if you determine that combination was the way the Commission wanted to proceed.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Hatch?

MR. HATCH: Commissioner Deason, with respect to opening statements, AT&T would like the opportunity to make an opening statement. We were going to propose that in the sense of perhaps a ten-minute time limit, something like that. Nothing too long or lengthy.

with respect to limiting the witnesses' summaries, that's particularly problematic, because that's going to involve, at least in one instance, our presentation of that CD-ROM that Ms. White referred to. To the extent that you want to limit a witness summary to, for example, ten minutes, that's okay with us. The only request that we would make is that we have the opportunity to be cumulative on the ten minutes per witness. For example, we could use 15 minutes on one and no time on another witness, or some example like that, because it will involve, particularly the presentation of the CD-ROM.

With respect to combination of direct and rebuttal, AT&T would like the opportunity to present

rebuttal, and we would like to keep them separate.

Clearly we understand the time constraints that we're

on, but nonetheless would still like the opportunity to

keep them separate if possible.

And I would echo Mr. Melson's comments with respect to there are some instances where AT&T does not line up with MCI, and would like the opportunity to explore the differences.

MR. FALVEY: With respect to the time limit for witness summaries, ACSI supports that idea and -- but would like a minimum of ten minutes, and I also support AT&T's suggestion that we have the latitude to perhaps do 15 minutes for a costing witness and, you know, five minutes for a technical witness.

With respect to opening statements, if the Commission believes that they would be helpful, ACSI would be happy to comply, and it might help bring the elements of the case together up front so that you can see where the testimony fits in as it comes in.

In terms of consolidating direct and rebuttal, ACSI would prefer to consolidate its direct and rebuttal, given the number of witnesses and the timing of putting our witnesses on. I don't think we want to be putting them on on Wednesday and then flying them back down here on Saturday night at 11 p.m., or whenever

the final rebuttal is put on.

In terms of friendly cross on non-common issues, I think we understand the time constraints, but ACSI would also like to have -- I think my main concern on that issue is that the Commission recognize the extent to which the testimony is intertwined, that if there are costing issues on one subject, and they're, for instance, on the switching component, but the discussion goes to critical costing methodology issue, that we be permitted to engage in that give and take. So that would be my only concern on -- in that respect.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I guess I'm a little confused. You want to be able to engage in what give and take?

MR. FALVEY: My concern is that there will be costing issues that will thread throughout the proceeding and that some of these issues may come up in the context of an element that we are not a party to, and I would -- I'm not saying we're going to be crossing on every issue, and like I said, we understand the overall framework of this proceeding, but I don't want four hours of costing cross, on generic costing issues, to take place on the switching or the transport element and have ACSI precluded from participating in that four hours of cross and redirect and so on.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff?

MS. CANZANO: Regarding -- Staff would recommend we combine direct and rebuttal testimony to save time.

The cross-examination issue of the witnesses, I would recommend that where the parties need to clarify and conduct appropriate cross-examination to point out the differences in positions, they should be allowed to cross the witnesses even though they do have the same issues, but I would caution the parties that that would be subject to objections, as appropriate, by BellSouth, or Staff, if we perceive friendly cross being conducted.

with regard to time limit on the witnesses' summaries and the opening statements, that would be within the -- your discretion as to whether you think that will be helpful, and I believe that -- I assume that we're going to go off the record and take a break to discuss the purpose of the CD-ROM that AT&T wants to present. So I have no recommendation on that at this time.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. White, was it your suggestion that there be opening statements?

MS. WHITE: Again, I don't think we necessarily have a position one way or the other. I

just wanted to make it a suggestion, in case the other parties were interested, or the commissioner thought it might help the process of the hearing.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, opening statements are discretionary; is that correct? They're discretionary?

MS. CANZANO: Yes.

commissioner deason: All right. For purposes of the hearing we will combine direct and rebuttal testimony. Cross-examination on common issues will be limited to differences in positions on those issues, and to the extent that there is commonality of positions and cross-examination is used to reinforce that commonality of position is subject to objection, Ms. White.

There will not be opening statements. I think parties need to realize that we have a draft prehearing order and a final prehearing order that's going to probably be in the neighborhood of 50 to 100 pages. That will be reviewed by the commissioners prior to the beginning of the hearing. I don't think that opening — given the time crunch that we're going to be under, opening statements will not add anything to this proceeding. Therefore we will not have opening statements.

The witness summaries are going to be limited

to five minutes and there will not be any accumulation of time from one witness to another witness. Each witness has five minutes. I will allow a request for a particular witness to be made at the time that witness takes the stand, and the chairman can deal with that. Right now my ruling is five minutes, and that is going to be the ruling unless there is some valid reason that the chairman agrees with to change that ruling.

Anything else of a preliminary nature?

Mr. Melson?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

MR. MELSON: Chairman Deason, I don't know whether this is preliminary or not, but I'll bring it During the deposition of one of the BellSouth cost witnesses -- I don't frankly remember whether it was this week or last, the days run together -- we learned that BellSouth has additional cost studies underway, at least one of which is supposed to be completed tomorrow, and possibly additional cost studies that could be completed prior to the time of the hearing. We would like to try and understand whether BellSouth intends to offer those cost studies at the hearing. To the extent that they come on the eve of the hearing, MCI would not have an adequate opportunity to review them and would likely object, and I thought maybe this was something we could get clarified this morning.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Ms. White?

MS. WHITE: Yes, sir. The cost studies that Mr. Melson is talking about are the total element long run incremental cost studies that the FCC order requires, and which MCI, AT&T and ACSI have been looking for ever since the order came out. When the order came out, BellSouth reviewed it, looked at what the methodology was involved in order to conduct a TELRIC cost study — because it has not conducted those before — and began developing TELRIC studies in accordance with the FCC order for various elements and for various states. They're state specific studies.

It's my understanding that the TELRIC cost studies for the loops, the two-wire analog, the four-wire digital and -- the two- and four-wire analog and the four-wire digital, are to be completed tomorrow.

I believe it was asked of our witness in deposition if BellSouth was conducting TELRIC studies, and she said yes and advised the Commission and the other parties that these studies would be available tomorrow.

To the extent that MCI and AT&T are saying that you must default to the proxy rate if you don't have a TELRIC cost study, then I think the TELRIC cost

studies are important and need to be made a part of the record for whatever weight the Commission wants to give them.

3

5

7

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

I understand the parties' frustration at the fact that they're not ready until the Friday before the hearing. However, as I said, this was definitely not intentional. You know, we've been working on them as fast as we can. And of all the unbundled elements that these parties are seeking, only the -- these three loops will the cost studies be completed by. So I think it's wrong to say that they shouldn't be used at the hearing, because they are specifically relevant until the -- as I said, I don't know what's going to happen today with regard to the stay of the FCC order. If that stay is not continued, then the rules would go into effect and we would -- BellSouth would be required to provide TELRIC studies. As of tomorrow, it will have these three TELRIC studies. I don't think it's right or appropriate for the Commission to be asked to ignore them.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Melson?

MR. MELSON: Let me respond briefly. During the deposition we were told the two-wire analog study would be available tomorrow. I am now learning for the first time that there are two additional studies that

expect to be completed. MCI has put forward a study in this proceeding which we believe is a TELRIC cost study. We're not asking the Commission to ignore them, we're asking them to look to the studies that are on file in the proceeding.

To the extent that BellSouth's cost witness could be made available to us for further deposition, MCI would not have an objection to the three cost studies that Ms. White has identified. I took it from her comments that there are no studies beyond those that BellSouth expects to have completed by the time of the hearing, and again, that's a clarification beyond what we had heard during the deposition. We would object to anything beyond those three.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. White, are there any cost studies beyond the three which we just discussed?

MS. WHITE: Ms. Sims is advising me that there may be some ready next week. I do not know that for a fact. If it would help matters, I think BellSouth could agree that if we could provide Ms. Caldwell, who is our cost witness, for a deposition on these three TELRIC loop cost studies, and we would just file the other TELRIC studies when they are developed but would not expect them to necessarily be a part of this case. I mean it might -- we might have to come back and revisit

it, I quess, because if the Commission decides to put in 1 a proxy rate until a TELRIC study is done and the TELRIC 2 study is done, then you might have to have another 3 hearing on that. But if it would help matters along, I would agree to be able to produce Ms. Caldwell for 5 another deposition on the TELRIC loop studies that will 6 be ready by tomorrow. 7 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That being the two- and 8 four-wire analog and four-wire digital loop? 10 MS. WHITE: Yes. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Melson. 11 MR. MELSON: So long as we are then given some 12 latitude to have our cost witness respond, if necessary, 13 at the hearing, I believe that -- what Ms. White has suggested would be appropriate. 15 MS. WHITE: And of course, I think that would 16 17 be only fair. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Hatch? 18 MR. HATCH: I would echo Mr. Melson's 19 comments. 20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Falvey? 21 I would just like to add briefly 22 MR. FALVEY: that, frankly, ACSI's position is that cost studies 23 produced four days before the hearing cannot be

effectively analyzed. They may be available in Florida

1 on Friday. Our expert is up in Maryland. So he's going to receive them on Saturday. My concern here is that, you know, a TELRIC study is very similar to a TSLRIC study. The TSLRIC standard has been floating around the FCC for years, and this train has been coming down the track for a long time. And it seems to me that the -these studies could have been produced a lot earlier than four days before the hearing. Where there's a will there's a way, and I don't see the way --

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Falvey, I agree where there's a will there's a way. You can review those studies. If you want to address them somehow in this proceeding, you shall, you will be granted that opportunity. I want to point out to you that you requested to be consolidated in this proceeding with the time frames in this proceeding and we all have to operate under them. Understood?

MR. FALVEY: Understood, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Staff?

MS. CANZANO: If we receive the cost studies tomorrow, Staff feels that it can have adequate time to review them. But we are extremely concerned about something coming in on Monday or Tuesday, a day or two before the hearing, because these cost studies -- a lot goes into these cost studies, and Staff has been

spending a lot of time reviewing what it already has. || So if we get them tomorrow, we do think we'll be okay in reviewing them. But those are our concerns. 3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Cost studies are 4 going to be prepared and presented tomorrow, will be 5 officially -- actually filed with the Commission or just given to the parties? What is your --MS. WHITE: We'll file with the Commission. 8 And what I will do is I will commit for the people that are in Tallahassee, you know, if I have to, I'll put 10 them on Delta Dash and have Ms. Sims deliver them. 11 would probably be the best way to get them down here 12 tomorrow. 13 MS. CANZANO: And remember, it would have to 14 come into the clerk's office if it's confidential. 15 MS. WHITE: I understand that. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Are the parties going to 17 work out the deposition schedule among -- between themselves? 19 MR. MELSON: We can do that. 20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Is there any way to 21 expedite a copy of that to Mr. Falvey's expert in Maryland? 23 Mr. Falvey, if you will communicate with them 24

and maybe you can get that a day earlier than Saturday,

perhaps you can get it tomorrow. 1 MR. FALVEY: That would be great if we could 2 fax a summary or something. 3 MS. WHITE: And then we could talk about 4 faxing it, or whatever plane goes to where your witness 5 is, maybe we can put it on it. 6 MR. FALVEY: We'll work it out. 7 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I would encourage you to 8 work it out, and if you can save a day, I would 9 encourage you to do that. 10 MS. CANZANO: Also, Staff would request 11 BellSouth have Ms. Caldwell available for possible 12 deposition on Monday or Tuesday after we review the cost 13 studies this weekend, and if we feel the need to examine 14 her. 15 16 MS. WHITE: Yes, and we'll be glad to do I do have to admit, however, that it may have to be by telephone, because there are arbitration hearings 18 going on next week in North Carolina in which she's a 19 witness. And I'm not sure what day she'll actually be on the stand. 21 MS. CANZANO: That would be fine. 22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Other preliminary 23 matters? Mr. Melson, do you have any others? 24

MR. MELSON: I don't believe so.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Hatch? 1 MR. HATCH: There is one. In view of the 2 length and the complexity of the issues in this 3 proceeding, AT&T would like to request an expansion of the page limit on post-hearing briefs. 5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do you have a 6 7 suggestion? MR. HATCH: Our suggestion is 125 pages. 8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Expand it from 60 to 9 125? 10 MR. HATCH: Yes, sir. 11 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Other parties wish to 12 address that suggestion? Ms. White? 13 I'm kind of appalled at 125 MS. WHITE: Yes. 14 pages. I agree that it may need to be expanded, but I 15 guess 125 pages sounds like an awfully big expansion. 16 What about a compromise at something like 80 or 90? 17 MR. HATCH: You don't have to use up all 125. 18 19 MS. WHITE: Yes, but if you write 125, I'll have to write 125. 20 MS. CANZANO: And Staff will have to read it 21 22 all. MS. WHITE: And Staff will have to read it 23 Part of that, though, is the rule says that you 25 have to set off your position in asterisks in 50 words

or less. I think there's some of these issues with so many subparts that that's not going to be possible. 2 we may have a problem in that that may need some relief 3 there. THE COURT: Mr. Melson? 5 MR. MELSON: I believe some expansion is 6 7 appropriate, but I'm not going to have the time to write 125 pages. 8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Horton? 9 MR. HORTON: We only have one issue, so 125 10 pages, that should be plenty for us. 11 12 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff? MS. CANZANO: Staff requests that ACSI does 13 not take up a full 125 pages for that issue. 14 I believe some expansion may be necessary in 15 this case, but I think 125 pages is just too much from 16 our perspective, for the briefs. 17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. What about 18 the concern about the word limitation on the position 19 20 statement? MS. CANZANO: I think that's a legitimate 21 22 concern, and I think that should be expanded. Ms. White, do you have another idea as to what 23 you think it should be expanded to?

MS. WHITE: Well, maybe just expand on --

expand on the issues of subparts. I know the issue that I'm most concerned about is 10a and 10b, because there's just no way -- and I'm not even sure -- I know I didn't count them. I tried to make mine as short as possible, and I didn't count up the words, but I know it's -- maybe if we can just waive the requirement on that particular issue, 10a and 10b, we might be okay on the rest.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: We'll just interpret the rule for purposes of this proceeding to be 50 words per subpart, so that if there is an issue with three subparts, it's a total of 150 for that particular issue.

As to the request to expand the total pages in the brief, I think that this case -- if there ever were a case that was justified to expand the brief, I believe that this is one. However, I do think 125 is probably excessive. I'll set the limitation as 100 pages.

Anything else?

Any other preliminary matters by any party?

Staff, is it your suggestion we proceed into the draft prehearing order?

MS. CANZANO: Yes, it is.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I have two versions of the draft. I have one that I was working from

yesterday. I have one from this morning. My question to Staff is, are they substantially the same, or are they significantly different?

MS. CANZANO: They're essentially the same.

We've tried to clean it up as much as we could. We've added a case background to your version, and some positions of parties had been omitted from your version, as well as there were problems with the exhibits. Do you have both copies with you?

will probably do is I'm going to work from the version that I was working from yesterday, which is not the most current, so that if there's some discrepancy or whatever, that may be the reason. Staff, just point it out to me, I'll look it up in the most current version, because I have some notations I have made on the version I was working from yesterday, and that's why I want to work from it.

MS. CANZANO: Okay, just recognize that the page numbers will be different.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. I'll be working basically with issue numbers most likely.

Okay, we can proceed then into the draft prehearing order, Section 1 being case background. Any changes or corrections to the case background?

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason? 1 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes. 2 MR. MELSON: On the appearances Ms. McMillin 3 is listed under AT&T rather than MCI. She should be 4 5 moved. MS. CANZANO: We saw that, Rick. 6 MR. MELSON: And I've got several typos that I 7 don't intend to go through today. I'll just get with Staff on those, with your permission. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes. And I appreciate 10 your bringing that up. If there are just clerical or typographical type corrections that need to be made, 12 obviously you can communicate those to Staff at the 13 conclusion of the prehearing conference, and I'm sure they will be glad to incorporate those. 15 MR. MELSON: In the statement of case 16 background, in the paragraph specifically relating to MCI, that paragraph does not reflect the date on which

background, in the paragraph specifically relating to MCI, that paragraph does not reflect the date on which MCI filed its request for arbitration with the Commission. And I would just like to ask that the Staff add, perhaps, a sentence at the end of that paragraph to reflect that we filed our request for arbitration on August 15th.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Would that be on Page 3?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MELSON: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, you can make that addition?

MS. CANZANO: Yes, we will.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Anything else concerning case background?

Section 2 addresses procedure for handling confidential information, which is standard for Commission proceedings, and there is the requirement that parties give notice of the intention to utilize confidential information at the hearing. Has that been done in this proceeding?

MR. MELSON: I don't believe so,

Commissioner. It's my understanding -- and again, this,

I guess, is more a question directed to BellSouth, is

that BellSouth does intend to offer as exhibits at the

hearing a number of proprietary cost studies.

MS. WHITE: That's correct. And I believe that all of the parties to this case, including the Staff, do have copies of these cost studies, the ones that were previously filed, and will have copies of the new cost studies on these three items tomorrow. So I would assume that they would also be using these, or be cross-examining on these cost studies. Requests for confidential classification have been filed by BellSouth

on these items.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, have you been put on notice as to exactly what confidential information is going to be utilized during the cross-examination of the witnesses?

MS. CANZANO: Not the exact information, but perhaps during a break we can meet with the parties and discuss it so this way we make sure that we all agree as to what will be proffered.

commissioner deason: Very well. I just don't want there to be any surprises at the hearing as far as confidential information is concerned, so that everyone is apprised of what is going to be utilized at the hearing. And obviously I think all parties have practiced before the Commission long enough to know the procedure as far as the mechanics of actually distributing, collecting and discussing confidential information. And I just would expect all parties to abide by that.

Okay, anything else on the Section 2? Section 3, prefiled testimony and exhibits.

MS. WHITE: BellSouth has one change. On Page 7, at the end of the list of direct witnesses, BellSouth's witness, Vic Atherton, should be added. I believe he filed direct testimony, as well as rebuttal.

MS. CANZANO: And Ms. White, where would you 1 place him in your order of witnesses? 2 3 MS. WHITE: You can put him last. MR. HATCH: We've got a couple of comments 4 with respect to the order of witnesses. 5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Just a moment. 6 Ms. White, that was -- who are you adding as a 7 direct witness? 8 MS. WHITE: The full name is William V. 9 Atherton, A-T-H-E-R-T-O-N. He is already a witness in 10 the rebuttal section of the witness list and he needs to 11 be added to the direct section. 12 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. 13 MS. WHITE: And one other thing for 14 BellSouth. BellSouth had not put the -- had not matched 15 the witness to the issue that they were going to testify 16 about because BellSouth was under the understanding that 17 a new issue list would be put out. I do have a 1.8 handwritten list of which witness goes with each -- what 19 issue as it's numbered now, and I'll be glad to give 20 that to the Staff and any party who may want a copy. 21 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, there may be some 22 renumbering as a result of previous decisions today and 23 maybe some decisions later. I'm not sure. And that

probably would be helpful after the renumbering if you

could provide that information, and that would pertain
to all parties as well.

MS. WHITE: I'll be glad to. I can provide at both times this list and a new one, or whichever the parties want.

MS. CANZANO: That would be very helpful for Staff.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay, other questions or concerns about prefiled testimony and order of witnesses?

MR. HATCH: With respect to the order of witnesses, I believe we have provided the list of the issue identification with respect to witnesses to Staff already, although it's not reflected here.

With respect to the order, as it's listed here, AT&T has a suggested order that's different than in the prehearing order, and I'll go ahead and read that to you. What we would prefer to have is Mr. Cresse first, followed by Mr. Gillan, then Mr. Shurter and Mr. Tamplin and Dr. Kaserman, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Sather, Mr. Lerma and then with Mr. Carroll last.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Could you go through that one more time, please?

MR. HATCH: Sure. Mr. Cresse, Mr. Gillan, Mr. Shurter, Mr. Tamplin, Dr. Kaserman, Mr. Ellison,

Mr. Sather, Mr. Lerma and Mr. Carroll.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Did Staff get those changes?

MS. CANZANO: Yes.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason, MCI has got no change in the order of its witnesses. I would like to note that Mr. Caplan and Dr. Cornell are testifying in other states that week and neither of them is available in Florida on the 9th. They would both be available the 10th or 11th. I think it's unlikely we would get to them on the 9th in any event, but if we could note they would not be taken on the first day of the hearing, I would appreciate it.

MS. WHITE: I'm sorry, Rick, which witnesses?
MR. MELSON: Mr. Caplan and Dr. Cornell.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: We will make a notation in the prehearing order that they are not available on those days, that being the 9th. For both Caplan and Cornell?

MR. MELSON: Yes, sir.

commissioner deason: And -- but I, in the prehearing order, am not guaranteeing it. This will be the chairman's prerogative. She's going to be running this hearing. It's her responsibility to get this hearing concluded in the time frames, and if she calls a

witness and they're not there, you can just deal with her at that time.

MR. HATCH: One request for clarification,
Commissioner Deason. The question just came up that if
you're combining direct and rebuttal, is your
five-minute limit for both direct and rebuttal
simultaneously?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's a good question.

I would take it to be your position that since we're combining, it should be ten minutes?

MR. HATCH: Fair guess.

should realize that all the testimony has been prefiled and that testimony is being reviewed. We're going to be under severe time constraints to conclude this hearing. I'm going to leave it at five minutes. You can ask the chairman that if it is a witness that has both direct and rebuttal that is being filed, to be given the latitude to allow ten minutes on the summary. And if she feels benevolent in that regard, well, then, you can have ten minutes, but I'm not setting it at ten minutes in the prehearing order.

MR. HORTON: Commissioner Deason, with respect to ACSI's witnesses, I just want to make one requested change in the order. We would like to take

| 1 | Mr. Robertson first this is on Page 7 |
|-----|--|
| 2 | Mr. Robertson, Mr. Stipe and then Dr. Kahn. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Mr. Robertson would be first |
| 4 | then? |
| 5 | MR. HORTON: Yes. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Other changes in order |
| 7 | of witnesses? Very well. |
| 8 | MS. CANZANO: Staff would just like to clarify |
| 9 | that all parties, not just BellSouth, provide Staff with |
| .0 | the issue numbers corresponding to the witness, and that |
| .1 | would be for this copy, as well as the renumbered copy, |
| .2 | so that we can be sure we have it straight. |
| .3 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: All parties understand |
| 4 | the request from Staff? |
| .5 | MR. MELSON: Yes. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, you're going to |
| .7 | have to provide them the renumbered issues as quickly as |
| .8 | possible as well. |
| 9 | MS. CANZANO: Yes, I will. |
| 0.0 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Section 5, basic |
| 21 | positions. MCI used up their whole brief on their basic |
| 22 | position. |
| 23 | MR. MELSON: It's shorter than BellSouth's, |
| 24 | Your Honor. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Changes or corrections |

to basic positions? Very well. Section 6, issues and positions, first section being issues common to all three parties to this proceeding. And that first issue is -- has been designated Issue 10a. Changes or corrections to Issue 10a?

Very well. Issue 10b?

The next section is the section involving issues common to AT&T, MCI and BellSouth, that first issue being Issue 12. Changes or corrections?

Issue 1? 7? 2? 5? 14? 3a? 3b? Issue 4? Issue 8?

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason? This is the first of the issues which you indicated MCI would not be permitted to arbitrate. I would ask that you retain MCI's position in the prehearing order, perhaps with a bold face notation regarding your ruling, but to the extent that we seek reconsideration of that and it were granted, I believe it would be more helpful if our position was set out.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I agree. And it can be so designated.

MS. CANZANO: Yes, it will.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Issue 11. And that would likewise apply to the other issues as well, Mr. Melson.

MR. MELSON: Yes, sir, I would appreciate 1 2 that. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Issue 11? 13? 9? 6? 3 16? 17a? 17b? 5 MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason, on Issue 17b, we would adopt the AT&T position. 6 7 COMMISSIONER DEASON: So you will not have any cross-examination of AT&T witness on this issue? 8 MR. MELSON: That's correct. 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Issue 19? 10 Issue 20? Issue 22? Issue 23? 11 Now proceeding to the section involving issues 12 specific to AT&T and BellSouth. Issue 21? Issue 15? 13 The next section is the section addressing 14 issues specific to MCI and BellSouth. Issue 24? 15 MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason, this is the 16 first of the issues that would be completely taken out 17 under your ruling. Again, I would like to have the 18 issue shown and MCI's position stated. It might be 19 helpful if the Staff grouped the issues that were out toward the end of this section, so that we had the 21 issues that clearly were to be arbitrated listed first 22 and then the ones that have been ruled out toward the 23 end. 24

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can Staff make that

25

accommodation?

MS. CANZANO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Issue 25?

Issue 26? Issue 27 will be treated as we described for Issue 24. Issue 28? Issue 29 will be treated as Issue 24.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason, Issue 29 -COMMISSIONER DEASON: Oh, that was withdrawn.
MR. MELSON: -- has been withdrawn, yes, sir.
COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Yes. Issue
That concludes the MCI-specific issues.

The next section addresses the post-hearing procedure. And we have positions from all the parties.

Any changes -- I'm sorry, AT&T?

MR. HATCH: Commissioner Deason, I apologize. I've come to term that piece the disappearing document. It was done, it was done as a separate document when we prepared the prehearing statement, and it didn't get attached. So that when we filed it, it wasn't attached. It was done to be filed on Monday, the day after the prehearing statement was due on Friday, and apparently it never happened. But the short answer to your question is, on procedure, is that AT&T's posture on this issue is that 14 days from the date the Commission's order is issued should be sufficient time

for us to negotiate an arrangement with BellSouth. If there is no agreement at that time, then it would be brought back to the Commission upon an issue-by-issue arbitration based on proposed contractual language of each of the parties with respect to the issues still at issue. Forgive the redundancy.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can you provide exact wording to Staff to incorporate?

MR. HATCH: Yes.

MR. MELSON: Chairman Deason?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes.

MR. MELSON: I would like to inquire. Do you expect that either you or the Commission will rule on this procedure prior to the outset of the hearing? Or is this a matter that you would expect to have briefed?

commissioner DEASON: I do not anticipate on ruling on this before the hearing. The first opportunity that the full Commission could rule upon this -- I assume it's possible that it could be done at the hearing itself, but I'm not sure that the other commissioners would be comfortable with doing so.

Staff, do you have any comments?

MS. CANZANO: Yes, I was thinking that we need -- I believe the full Commission needs to rule on that, and I also think that needs to be phrased as an

issue. So a suggestion would be: What is the proposed -- what is the appropriate -- what are the appropriate post-hearing procedures for submission approval of a final arbitrated agreement?

commissioner deason: I would anticipate that it could be briefed, but I would not anticipate it would be something that would take necessarily a large part of your brief to address.

MR. MELSON: No, sir, I was wondering whether the intention, frankly, was for the Commission to rule on it at the outset, or at the conclusion of the hearing, or whether it would be ruled on only with the other issues.

commissioner deason: Well, to me, it would be preferable -- and there are four other commissioners, they may not think it's preferable. I think it would be preferable to give the parties as much advance notice before the actual order comes out in this proceeding, so that the parties would be able to prepare for whatever the post-hearing procedure is going to be.

So I would suggest that Staff somehow communicate to the other commissioners that this is something that the parties would like as much advance guidance as possible. And if it's something that could be addressed at the hearing itself, perhaps we could do

it before the hearing is actually adjourned and give parties notice as to how the Commission anticipates proceeding. But if procedurally that can't be done, so be it, but I think it would be important for parties to have that guidance.

MS. CANZANO: It was also my understanding that the parties and Staff wanted to brief this issue, more than just have a paragraph. We anticipated it as being incorporated into the post-hearing briefs. But if --

commissioner deason: Well, let me ask the parties, do you have a preference? Do you want to brief it, or do you want to try to get as much advance guidance as possible so you can prepare for things to come?

MS. WHITE: I think BellSouth is kind of torn on that. In order for it to be decided by the whole commission, it probably needs to be an issue, but then if it's an issue, it's not briefed and decided until the order comes out, which is kind of late in the game.

I guess I wonder if we could have it as an issue, but that that issue could have an expedited decision. I don't know if that's allowed by the rules, just a suggestion.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I agree. I think it

needs to be listed as an issue, but I think that perhaps we need -- if it is at all possible and the other commissioners are agreeable to doing so, is to having this as a bench decision before the end of the hearing, and give parties an opportunity to make a brief oral argument on what would be the appropriate procedure, and if the other commissioners are comfortable in making that procedural decision, to do that before the hearing is adjourned, or if that's not possible, to have an expedited decision before the decisions on all of the substantive issues and the decision on the order is issued.

Staff, I will leave it to you to try to communicate that to the other commissioners and express that there is an interest, a valid interest in trying to get this procedural guidance as quickly as possible.

MS. CANZANO: We will do that.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well.

MS. WHITE: The only thing I would ask, maybe if we're going to do it via oral argument, again, maybe there should be a time limit put on it and a specific time set, like it's going to be the last thing done before the hearing is adjourned.

MR. HATCH: If it's the last thing done, no one is going to spend a whole lot of time on it.

MS. WHITE: Or the first thing done. It
doesn't matter to me, but I just meant put it in a
specific place and give parties a time limit. I meant
put it in a specific place so we know that at 10:00 on
this date we have to do this. I have to be led by the
hand these days.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, discuss this with
the chairman and find out what her preference is as far
as whether there should be a designated time to address
this during the hearing itself, or if it's going to be

as whether there should be a designated time to address this during the hearing itself, or if it's going to be the last matter taken up. I don't know exactly what her plans are for processing the day-to-day activities of this hearing, and if you get that input from her, you can just incorporate that.

MS. CANZANO: We will definitely do that.

Staff has raised another issue that ought to be included in this case, and I realize this is the last minute, but in the other arbitration cases, we have been raising as an issue is: Should the agreement be approved pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996?

MS. WHITE: I assume by that you mean the -COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me -- why shouldn't

MS. CANZANO: I think there is -- just to set

it?

what the standards ought to be in terms of clarification. COMMISSIONER DEASON: I assume this would be a 3 4 legal issue? 5 MS. CANZANO: Yes. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do the parties get the 6 7 issue? MS. WHITE: One more time? 8 MS. CANZANO: Should the agreement be approved 9 pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act 10 of 1996? And that would be the same issue that has been 11 raised in the BellSouth MFS docket, and also the MFS 12 United/Centel docket. And parties can give Staff a 13 position on that later. COMMISSIONER DEASON: When do you plan on 15 issuing this prehearing order? MS. CANZANO: Probably for the prehearing 17 order, when we expect it, early next week. COMMISSIONER DEASON: You just need to get 19 these positions from everyone as quickly as possible. 20 MS. CANZANO: By close of business Friday. 21 Is that possible? 22 MS. WHITE: Our position on this last issue 23 that we just added? 24 MS. CANZANO: 25

| 1 | MS. WHITE: Yes, that's possible. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. HATCH: It's probably going to have to |
| 3 | be. |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, I think it will |
| 5 | be. My concern is that obviously, is that the order |
| 6 | be given to the commissioners as quickly as possible, as |
| 7 | well. There's a lot of meat in the order. And since |
| 8 | we're not going to have opening statements, I'm sure |
| 9 | they're going to want to rely on it even more. |
| 10 | There has been an issue which has been |
| 11 | designated Issue 31 raised by ACSI. |
| 12 | MR. HORTON: Commissioner, that should be |
| 13 | stricken. That comment goes to the procedures we were |
| 14 | just talking about. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Any other matters |
| 16 | concerning issues? |
| 17 | Section 7, exhibit list? |
| 18 | Section 8, proposed stipulations? It would be |
| 19 | acceptable to the Commission if this matter got settled |
| 20 | between now and the hearing. |
| 21 | MR. HATCH: I expect nothing would please |
| 22 | everybody, at least in this room, more. |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Section 9, pending |
| 24 | motions? Staff? |
| 25 | MS. CANZANO: There are a number of discovery |

motions pending. And I think we should -- I also believe that there's one motion that could -- I understand is resolved, regarding ACSI's motion to shorten time for BellSouth's response; is that correct?

MS. WHITE: That's correct.

MR. FALVEY: Yes, that's correct.

MS. CANZANO: I don't suppose the other motions are resolved?

MR. HATCH: To date, no.

MS. WHITE: Today, no. I would be willing to have the decision be made by the prehearing officer on the pleadings that have already been submitted, if the other parties agree.

MR. HATCH: Does not bother me, Commissioner Deason, unless you want to --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me -- we're going to take a break in a few minutes, and the CD-ROM situation needs to be discussed during that break as well. I need to get clearly in my mind what is pending and what is not pending at this point. So if Staff wants to describe that, or if the parties want to describe that, it doesn't matter to me, but I need that understanding. Staff?

MS. CANZANO: I would like to put forth what I believe is at issue still, and if there are other

matters, I would like the parties to raise them. I have that AT&T filed a motion to compel against BellSouth for -- regarding its first set of interrogatories and PODs, and that AT&T filed that motion on September 26th. I do not -- I'm not sure if BellSouth has responded to it yet. I have not seen it.

MS. WHITE: The response is due today.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: So BellSouth's response

is due today?

MS. WHITE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And you're willing to let me rule on the pleadings and you have not yet filed one?

MS. WHITE: Well, the pleading that's going to be filed today.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Oh, it's going to be filed today?

MS. WHITE: Yes, it's going to be filed today, and I think I have a copy here if somebody wants it, but the pleading that's filed today, yes.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.

MS. CANZANO: We also have the ACSI, that one motion to shorten time, which has been resolved. I also have two motions to compel against BellSouth, one regarding its first set of interrogatories and the other

| 1 | regarding the first set of Pobs. |
|----|--|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: A motion to compel that |
| 3 | was filed against BellSouth? |
| 4 | MS. CANZANO: Yes, by ACSI. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: There's been two such |
| 6 | motions filed by ACSI? |
| 7 | MS. CANZANO: Yes, regarding motions to |
| 8 | compel. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. What is the first |
| 10 | motion? |
| 11 | MS. CANZANO: A motion to compel BellSouth to |
| 12 | answer its first set of interrogatories. |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: And the second? |
| 14 | MS. CANZANO: Motion to compel BellSouth to |
| 15 | answer its first set of PODs. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: And this was filed |
| 17 | when? |
| 18 | MS. CANZANO: Actually, I don't have the date |
| 19 | written down. Perhaps ACSI could assist me. |
| 20 | MR. FALVEY: The motion to compel on the |
| 21 | production of documents filed September 19th, and on the |
| 22 | interrogatories was also filed September 19th. |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. And |
| 24 | BellSouth has responded? |
| 25 | MS. WHITE: BellSouth has responded to ACSI's |

motion to compel interrogatories. Apparently there was 1 a mix-up on the service of the motion to compel 2 production of documents. BellSouth's request is due 3 tomorrow, or if you want oral argument on that one, I 4 could wing it. 5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: So there is a filed 6 response to the motion to compel as it pertains to the 7 first set of interrogatories? 8 That's correct. MS. WHITE: 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: There has not been a 10 filed response as it pertains to the production of 11 documents, and that is not due until tomorrow? 12 MS. WHITE: Until tomorrow. 13 COMMISSIONER DEASON: But you're willing to 14 15 make an oral argument today? MS. WHITE: If you want to go ahead and get it 16 over with. 17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Falvey? 18 MR. FALVEY: I think it might be a good idea 19 to do a brief oral argument, at least on the request for 20 production, in light of the fact that we haven't seen the papers, and I am prepared to do that today. 22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Other pending 23 matters? 24

MS. CANZANO: Also, BellSouth's motion to

25

compel AT&T regarding discovery, and I believe that Staff has a draft recommendation for you. 2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: When was this filed? 3 MR. HATCH: There are two of them, 4 Commissioner Deason. One, I believe, was filed in -- I 5 think August the 30th. The other one, I believe, was 6 filed September the 11th, if I'm not mistaken. AT&T 7 responded to each. 8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: And AT&T has responded 9 to both. Staff, do you have a recommended resolution of 10 11 that motion and response thereto? MS. CANZANO: Staff had drafted a draft order 12 13 for you to review. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay, any other pending 14 motions? 15 MS. CANZANO: None that Staff is aware of. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Any of the parties have 17 any other motions that are still pending that need to be 18 brought to the prehearing officer's attention? 19 Very well. We're going to take a recess. 20 Staff, I need to meet with you all and discuss these --21 the motions and -- as to how we're going to address them 22 here today. And I would encourage the parties to

discuss the CD-ROM situation and anything else that may

be out there that needs your attention.

We'll stand in recess until 10:45. 1 (Recess from 10:28 until 10:45 a.m.) 2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Call the prehearing 3 conference back to order. You may want to check your 4 microphones. 5 I believe, Commissioner Deason, MR. HATCH: 6 before you proceed too much further, I think that we 7 have resolved our discovery battles. 8 MS. WHITE: Some of them. With AT&T and MCI, 9 not with ACSI. 10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: All right. So explain 11 to me, is there anything I need to do at this point, or 12 as far as you're concerned everything is resolved? 13 MR. HATCH: It's my understanding that each 14 party, at least vis-a-vis AT&T and BellSouth, has agreed 15 to withdraw their respective motions to compel. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very good. So then that 17 leaves the ACSI two motions to compel against BellSouth 18 19 as the only pending motions in this matter; is that correct, Staff? 20 That's correct. 21 MS. CANZANO: COMMISSIONER DEASON: And BellSouth has 22 suggested that there be oral argument in this matter in 23 lieu of actually filing a written response to the 24

25

motion; is that correct?

MS. WHITE: Well, with regard to the production of document motion to compel. With regard to the interrogatories, we have filed a response, so we would ask that that just be decided on the pleadings.

MR. FALVEY: I have no problems with the interrogatories being decided on the pleadings.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Before we proceed any further in this regard, let me ask about the situation concerning the CD-ROM. Has that been addressed?

MR. HATCH: We have made progress with respect to that. I believe that our agreement is that we would offer it, I believe the way Ms. -- the way Nancy characterized it was as demonstrative evidence as compared to substantive evidence. There may be some question as to what that means. But principally, mechanically, for your purposes, Commissioner Deason, I think what's going on happen is that we are going to use that CD-ROM with Mr. Tamplin's testimony, as part of his summary. Now, we understand the time limits and so forth, and we'll have to make our case to the chairman in order to deal with that. In addition to that, we are also getting cleaner, better copies to the folks, BellSouth, the Staff and so forth, as to the actual pictures that are embedded in that CD-ROM.

1 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, I understand
2 there's an actual problem of utilizing that CD-ROM with
3 the equipment that we have here at the Commission?
4 MR. HATCH: For purposes of the hearing it
5 should not be a problem. We have our own machine that

we're bringing in that is an audio -- it's this giant,
funky computerized audio/visual machine that actually
will play it, we anticipate, on the screen that comes
down behind you, so that everybody will have a good,

MS. CANZANO: Mr. Hatch, I would just like to ask, what is on the CD-ROM, is that the same as those pictures that are attached to Mr. Tamplin's testimony?

MR. HATCH: That is correct. And we are endeavoring to get you cleaner copies of those.

MS. CANZANO: Thank you.

clean shot at what's being projected.

MS. WHITE: That's correct. Mr. Hatch's representation is correct. I think the only thing I would add is that it's my understanding that only the paper copies will be entered into the record as the exhibit to Mr. Tamplin's testimony, and the CD-ROM will not be entered into the record.

MR. HATCH: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Anything else before I address the motions to compel that were

filed by ACSI?

In regards to the first set of interrogatories which is the subject of the motion to compel, I'll be making a decision based upon the pleadings. In regard to the production of documents, there will be an oral argument held today at the conclusion of the GTE prehearing this afternoon. I cannot tell you what time that will be, but this matter, this prehearing conference, will be reconvened at that time. Now if the parties can work this out in the next four or five hours, that's great. If you can't, we'll have the oral argument.

MR. FALVEY: Commissioner Deason, we might be able to work it out in the next four or five minutes. I don't know if there's any way of bringing it back.

There were some discussions between AT&T and BellSouth going on while -- in the last break, so I didn't -- Nancy and I didn't have a chance to get together.

MS. WHITE: The other suggestion I might make is that maybe we could get a pleading filed today and have the decision be made on the pleadings. We would agree to that.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: No, you've got my interest now. We're going to have oral argument.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Deason, could the

non-combatants be excused from the continued 1 prehearing? 2 MS. WHITE: No, no. 3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: All those that have already agreed to their discovery disputes may be 5 dismissed from this prehearing conference, may be If you think that -excused. 7 MR. HORTON: Commissioner? 8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, Mr. Horton. 9 MR. HORTON: I was just going to ask, if we 10 are able to resolve something with BellSouth, can we 11 simply advise the Staff and --12 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Absolutely. If it can 13 be settled, advise the Staff and there will be no need 14 to reconvene this prehearing conference for purposes of 15 the oral argument on that discovery dispute. 16 MR. HORTON: Thank you. 17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Anything else to come 18 before the prehearing officer at this time? 19 MS. CANZANO: None that I am aware. Just so 20 that I'm straight, we're going to reconvene unless we're 21 notified that this matter has been resolved? COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes. We're going to 23 reconvene at a short time after the conclusion of the GTE prehearing conference for purposes of taking oral

25

argument on the motion to compel in regards to the first set of PODs that was filed by ACSI. So this portion of the prehearing conference is adjourned, realizing that it may be reconvened for that limited purpose at a subsequent time this afternoon. Thank you all. (Hearing concluded at 10:55 a.m.) ***** I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.