

**RAR Official Filing:**  
**3/26/01\*\*\*\*\*1:58 PM\*\*\*\*\*Kay Flynn\*\*\*\*\*1**

Kay Flynn

---

**To:** Kim Logue  
**Cc:** Margie Howard; Kimberley Pena  
**Subject:** RE: Docket 010313

Okay.

—Original Message—

**From:** Kim Logue  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2001 1:16 PM  
**To:** Kay Flynn  
**Cc:** Margie Howard; Kimberley Pena  
**Subject:** FW: Docket 010313

Please change docket title to read:

"Request by Smart City Telecommunications L.L.C. d/b/a Smart City Telecom (fka Vista-United Telecommunications) for approval of interim traffic termination and billing agreement with XO Florida, Inc."

Margie: Please change rec as well.

Kim: Is this now titled properly, pursuant to information below?

—Original Message—

**From:** Kimberley Pena  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2001 9:35 AM  
**To:** Kim Logue  
**Subject:** RE: Docket 010313

This is one of the agreements that were signed prior to the completion of the transaction on March 1, 2001. Section 11 or 12 says that they can assign this agreement to another company that has purchased all of its assets. Therefore it has been assigned to Smart City. As long as we put both names in the title. Smart City f/k/a Vista we will be fine. I was informed that there is a total of 18 agreements signed before March 1st. Every agreement after March 1st will have smart city on it.

—Original Message—

**From:** Kim Logue  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2001 9:19 AM  
**To:** Kimberley Pena; Beth Keating  
**Cc:** Kay Flynn  
**Subject:** Docket 010313

APP \_\_\_\_\_  
CAF \_\_\_\_\_  
CNP \_\_\_\_\_  
COM \_\_\_\_\_  
CTR \_\_\_\_\_  
ECR \_\_\_\_\_  
LEG \_\_\_\_\_  
OPC \_\_\_\_\_  
PAI \_\_\_\_\_  
RGO \_\_\_\_\_  
SEC \_\_\_\_\_  
SER \_\_\_\_\_  
OTI \_\_\_\_\_

Kim:  
I'm reviewing the agreements that landed on my desk Thursday, and I've hit a snag in the very first one.

In docket 010313, it's docketed and reads as if the agreement is between Vista-United and XO Florida. However, the new name is Smart City Telecommunications LLC dba Smart City Telecom (fka Vista-United Telecommunications).

Here's the question: Because the entire agreement reads that it is between Vista and XO, and because Smart City is the surviving name, or so it appears, should the agreement be withdrawn and submitted at such time when it is written as to be between Smart City and XO? I believe it should be, but wanted to get your input.

Please advise soonest, and I will contact the parties.

Kim

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
03824 MAR 26 01  
FPCO-RECORDS/REPORTING