

SPECIAL COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

VOTE SHEET

DATE: February 21, 1997

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.

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve the sections of MCI and BellSouth's arbitrated agreement identified in Exhibit A?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve the sections identified in Exhibit A. The sections are consistent with Section 251 of the Act and the Commission's arbitration order.

MODIFIED

Approved with addition of language in MCI's 2/13/97 filing ("Updates to MCI metro/BellSouth Interconnection Agreement")

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: Full Commission

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

[Handwritten signatures in the Majority column]

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

02-268-MAR-35

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

PSC/RAR33(5/90)

COMMISSIONER GARCIA PARTICIPATED IN THE VOTE VIA VIDEO TELECONFERENCING FROM MIAMI. IN HIS ORAL VOTE, HE: CONCURRED WITH THE MAJORITY / DISSENTED. COMMISSIONER GARCIA WILL SIGN THE ORIGINAL VOTE SHEET UPON HIS RETURN TO TALLAHASSEE.

Issue 2: Should the Commission incorporate language in the arbitration agreement for the disputed sections identified in Exhibit B that were not considered in the arbitration proceeding?

Recommendation: No. The Commission should not incorporate language in the arbitrated agreement for disputed issues that were not part of the arbitration proceeding. These sections should be eliminated from the final agreement approved by the Commission.

APPROVED

Issue 3: What language should the Commission include in the arbitrated agreement of MCI and BellSouth for those sections that are in dispute and were included in the arbitration proceeding?

Recommendation: The Commission should direct the parties to include in the arbitrated agreement the language for the specific sections that are identified in staff's analysis.

APPROVED

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No, this docket should remain open until the parties have filed their signed arbitration agreement, and the Commission has completed its review of BST's cost studies that were required to be filed pursuant to the order in this proceeding.

MODIFIED

The signed agreement incorporating the substance of today's decision is to be filed by March 7, 1997.