



GTE Telephone Operations

Marceil Morrell**
Vice President & General Counsel - Florida

Associate General Counsel
Anthony P. Gillman**
Leslie Reicin Stein*

Attorneys*
Kimberly Caswell
M. Eric Edgington
Ernesto Mayor, Jr.

One Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street, FLTC0007
Post Office Box 110
Tampa, Florida 33601
813-483-2606
813-204-8870 (Facsimile)

* Licensed in Florida
** Certified in Florida as Authorized House Counsel

October 29, 1996 - VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

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

Re: Docket Nos. 960847-TP and 960980-TP
Petitions by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., MCI
Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services,
Inc. for arbitration of certain terms and conditions of a proposed agreement with
GTE Florida Incorporated concerning interconnection and resale under the
Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Please find enclosed an original and fifteen copies of a revised page 45 of the
Posthearing Brief GTE Florida Incorporated submitted on October 28, 1996, in this
proceeding. This revised page deletes material that was inserted because of a clerical
error. Please discard the old page 45 and replace it with the new one. Copies of this
revision have been provided to the parties of record in this matter.

ACK _____
AFA _____
APP _____
CAF _____
CMU _____
CTR _____
EAG _____
LEG 2 _____
LIN 5 _____
OPC _____
RCH _____
SEC 1 _____
WAS _____
OTH _____

I apologize for the inconvenience this change may have caused you.

Sincerely,
Kim Caswell / tas

Kimberly Caswell
KC:tas

Enclosures
c: Parties of Record (w/e)

A part of GTE Corporation
FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
11515 OCT 30 96
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Revised 10-29-96

change has been rejected. GTE will, moreover, have to deal with dissatisfied customers who are told they need to make another phone call to get their PIC changed. Introduction of all of these inefficiencies is unjustified when the plain fact is that GTE must make the change in the end anyway.

In his prefiled testimony, GTE witness Drew allowed that, if an industry standard for AT&T's and MCI's approach could be developed, GTE would likely comply with it. (Drew, Tr. 2045.) At the hearing, AT&T offered into evidence part of a document from the National Order and Billing Forum (OBF) Committee purporting to adopt such a standard. This document reflected "final closure" on the PIC order process on August 29, 1996. AT&T's Rebuttal Testimony in this arbitration was filed on September 24, 1996. If the issue was very important to AT&T, one assumes the purported new standard would have been treated in its prefiled testimony.

In any case, Mr. Drew, GTE's OSS witness, was not aware of the apparently new standard AT&T mentioned. Particularly in light of Mr. Drew's testimony, it would have been more productive if AT&T had discussed this new information with GTE in an effort to reach some resolution through negotiation, instead of surprising GTE with it at the hearing. Nonetheless, GTE will evaluate AT&T's information based on the complete