	1		
1	FI OD:	BEFORE THE IDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
2	I LOIN.	DOCKET NO. 000075-TP (PHASE II)	
3	T. H. Mathan of	DOCKET NO. 000075-11 (THASE 11)	
4	In the Matter of		
5	INVESTIGATION INTO A METHODS TO COMPENSA	TE CARRIERS	
6	FOR EXCHANGE OF TRAIL TO SECTION 251 OF TI	HE 4 AMERICAN PARTIES AND	
7	TELECOMMUNICATIONS	ACT OF 1996.	
8		The state of the s	
9	ARE A C	ONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT	
10	THE OFF AND DO	FICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING NOT INCLUDE PREFILED TESTIMONY.	
11			
12	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING CONFERENCE	
13	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER LILA A. JABER	
14		Prehearing Officer	
15	DATE:	Wednesday, June 13, 2001	
16			
17	TIME:	Commenced at 9:30 a.m. Concluded at 10:15 a.m.	
18	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 152	
19		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
20	DEDODTED DV		
21	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR FPSC Division of Records & Reporting Chief, Bureau of Reporting	
22		(850) 413-6732	
23			
24			
25			

APPEARANCES:

MORTON POSNER, 1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036, appearing on behalf of Allegiance Telecom of Florida, Inc.

JIM LAMOREAUX, AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., 101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1549, appearing on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., MediaOne Florida

Telecommunications, Inc. and TCG of South Florida.

NANCY B. WHITE, E. EARL EDENFIELD and JAMES MEZA, c/o Nancy Sims, 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

NORMAN H. HORTON, JR., Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, Post Office Box 1876, Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876, appearing on behalf of e.spire Communications, Inc.

JON C. MOYLE, JR, Moyle Law Firm, The Perkins House, 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, and CHRISTOPHER SAVAGE, Cole, Raywid & Braverman, L.L.P, 1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20006, appearing on behalf of Global NAPS, Inc.

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

KENNETH A. HOFFMAN and MARTIN P. McDONNELL, Rutledge, Ecenia, Underwood, Purnell & Hoffman, P. O. Box 511, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 420, Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0551, appearing on behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC, and US LEC of Florida, Inc., AT&T Communications of the Southern States, MediaOne, TCG of South Florida, and Allegiance Telecom of Florida, Inc.

JOSEPH A. McGLOTHLIN, McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Dekker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen, 117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of The Florida Competitive Carriers Association.

DONNA C. McNULTY, 325 John Knox Road, Suite 105, Tallahassee, Florida 32303-4131, appearing on behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc.

SUSAN S. MASTERTON, P. O. Box 2214, Tallahassee, Florida 32316-2214, appearing on behalf of Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, and Sprint Communications Limited Partnership.

KAREN CAMECHIS and PETE DUNBAR, Pennington, Culpepper, Moore, Wilkinson, Dunbar & Dunlap, P.A., Post Office Box 10095, Tallahassee, Florida, 32302-0551, appearing on behalf of Time Warner Telecom of Florida, L.P.

APPEARANCES CONTINUED: KIMBERLY CASWELL, P. O. Box 100, FLTC0007, Tampa, Florida 33601-0110, appearing on behalf of Verizon Florida. Inc. SCOTT A. SAPPERSTEIN, One Intermedia Way, MC FLT-HQ3, Tampa, Florida 33647-1752, appearing on behalf of Intermedia Communications, Inc. MICHAEL R. ROMANO, 1025 Eldorado Boulevard. Broomfield, Colorado 80021, appearing on behalf of Level 3. RICHARD D. MELSON, Hopping Green Sams Smith, P.A., Post Office Box 6526, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of MCI WorldCom and Intermedia Communications, Inc. FELICIA BANKS and BETH KEATING, Florida Public Service Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 COMMISSIONER JABER: Good morning. 3 Counsel. read the notice. 4 MS. BANKS: Pursuant to notice issued May 23rd, 2001. 5 this time and place has been set for a prehearing in Docket 6 000075-TP, which is the investigation into appropriate methods 7 to compensate carriers for exchange of traffic subject to 8 Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. 9 COMMISSIONER JABER: Let's take appearances. We 10 don't have anyone on the phone, right? 11 No. That is correct. Commissioner Jaber. MS. BANKS: 12 COMMISSIONER JABER: Go ahead. 13 MR. EDENFIELD: Good morning. Kip Edenfield for 14 BellSouth. 15 MS. MASTERTON: Susan Masterton for Sprint. 16 MS. CASWELL: Kim Caswell for Verizon Florida. 17 Martin McDonnell. and I am here with MR. McDONNELL: 18 Ken Hoffman on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern 19 States, TCG, MediaOne, Level 3, Allegiance Telecom, and US LEC. 20 And if I could I would like to enter an appearance for Jim 21 Lamoreaux on behalf of AT&T, Morton Posner on behalf of 22 Allegiance Telecom, and Michael Romano for Level 3. 23 COMMISSIONER JABER: I need you to back up and repeat 24 Mr. Lamoreaux on behalf of AT&T. These are -it. 25 MR. McDONNELL: They are in the prehearing order,

1	Commissioner Jaber.			
2	COMMISSIONER JABER: in the new prehearing order,			
3	Felicia?			
4	MS. BANKS: Yes. I don't see Mr. Lamoreaux. I think			
5	that is an additional one.			
6	MR. McDONNELL: James Lamoreaux is along with Marsha			
7	Rule on the top of Page 2 of my draft.			
8	MS. BANKS: Okay. I'm sorry. Thank you.			
9	MR. McDONNELL: And Morton Posner on behalf of			
10	Allegiance is on Page 3; and Michael Romano on behalf of Level			
11	3 is on Page 2.			
12	COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you.			
13	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Joe McGlothlin for the FCCA. I am			
14	also appearing this morning for Intermedia Communications and			
15	would like to enter the appearance of Scott Sapperstein.			
16	COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you.			
17	MR. MELSON: Rick Melson on behalf of MCI WorldCom.			
18	Ms. McNULTY: Donna McNulty on behalf of MCI			
19	WorldCom.			
20	MS. CAMECHIS: Karen Camechis on behalf of Time			
21	Warner Telecom.			
22	COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Camechis, I do not see your			
23	name on the draft. Does that mean she hasn't that Time			
24	Warner didn't intervene, Felicia, or am I missing her name?			
25	MR. MELSON: On the top of Page 3.			

COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you. Mr. Dunbar. 1 2 MR. DUNBAR: I'm sorry, Jon Moyle on behalf of Global 3 NAPS. And I would also like to enter an appearance on behalf of Mr. Savage. And we are reflected accurately on Page 2 of 4 5 the draft. COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you. 6 MR. HORTON: And Norman H. Horton, Jr., for e.spire 7 8 Communications. 9 COMMISSIONER JABER: Anyone else? 10 Mr. Moyle, I take it since you are here I am to 11 disregard the request to be excused from the prehearing 12 conference? MR. MOYLE: Yes. ma'am. I did that out of a 13 14 precautionary measure. That was something that we were able to resolve in circuit court, it settled this morning. So we can 15 16 just disregard that. COMMISSIONER JABER: Okay. Any preliminary matters, 17 Ms. Banks? 18 MS. BANKS: I would like to enter an appearance, 19 Felicia Banks and Beth Keating on behalf of Commission staff. 20 21 COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you. 22 Ms. McNULTY: Commissioner Jaber, just a minor thing 23 before we move on. I just have a minor correction to Page 2. Although staff has promoted me to general counsel, if you just 24 put esquire that would be fine. Thank you. 25

1 COMMISSIONER JABER: Felicia told me that she had 2 heard a rumor that --3 (Laughter.) 4 MS. MASTERTON: Commissioner Jaber. I also have a 5 minor correction. On Page 1 it should say Sprint-Florida. 6 Incorporated and Sprint Communications Company, Limited 7 Partnership. 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: You are okay with esquire, then? 9 MS. MASTERTON: Yes. COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. Any other changes to 10 11 the appearances? 12 MR. McDONNELL: Yes. Commissioner Jaber, on Page 2, 13 Michael R. Romano, he is third from the bottom, it should read 14 Level 3 Communications, LLC, deleting the Inc. COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. Any other changes? 15 16 MS. BANKS: There was one more. On Page 3, the 17 second to the last listing, it should be Norman H. Horton, Jr. 18 COMMISSIONER JABER: Uh-huh, I saw that. Mr. Edenfield, can we take Nancy White and James Meza off? 19 20 MR. EDENFIELD: I wish you would leave them. Let me 21 make an appearance on their behalf, then, Ms. Nancy White and 22 James Meza. Mr. Meza is going to try the case with me, and 23 possibly Ms. White, but I'm not sure yet. 24 COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. 25 MS. CAMECHIS: And. Commissioner Jaber, I would like

1 to enter an appearance for Pete Dunbar, as well. Thank you. 2 COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. 3 MS. MASTERTON: I have a question. Sprint has a 4 pending motion to accept a revised prehearing statement. 5 Should we just wait for pending motions? But then when you get to the issues list, Issue 18 doesn't have a statement for 6 7 Sprint. So if that motion is granted then there will be one. 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: It was my intent to take that up into the preliminary matters. But apparently there have been 9 10 lots of changes to the appearances section. So before we move 11 on to the preliminary matters, let's make sure there are no 12 other changes to Pages 1, 2, and 3. All right. 13 Go ahead, Felicia. 14 MS. BANKS: On June 6th, Sprint filed what Ms. 15 Masterson just referenced, a motion to accept revised 16 prehearing statement. It is my understanding that Sprint has 17 conferred with parties and there is no objection. 18 COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. Let's confirm there 19 are no objections to Sprint's motion to revise its prehearing 20 statement. 21 MR. EDENFIELD: BellSouth has no objection. 22 COMMISSIONER JABER: Parties? All right. Show 23 Sprint's motion to accept a revised prehearing statement 24 granted. What is next? MS. BANKS: The next thing, and I think I will allow 25

1

2

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

13 14

12

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

or defer to Mr. Hoffman, there is a matter that I believe the Joint ALECs want to discuss.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Go ahead. Mr. Melson.

MR. MELSON: I will probably take this up. We are going to ask that you consider continuing the hearing in this It is currently scheduled for the 5th and 6th of July. Obviously right after the -- I would say the 4th of July weekend, except the fourth of July is on Wednesday this year. That is causing some travel concerns for our witnesses, probably nothing that is insurmountable.

But given the nature of the issues in this case, none of which appear to be of a nature that require immediate resolution, given the recent FCC activities which may have bearing on some of the issues, we have consulted with the parties and to the best of my knowledge all the parties represented here would support continuing this hearing out of July to some later date that fits on the Commission calendar.

We don't have a specific suggestion about time frame. Obviously, we wouldn't want it to languish forever, but it is not the type of thing where we feel like we need to find hearing dates within the next month in order to get the issues resolved. And so we would respectfully ask that you consider the possibility of finding some alternative dates for the hearing.

> MS. BANKS: Commissioner Jaber, if I could. Staff

just wants to note that I don't know if it is something that
would change the position to look at the possibility of
continuing, but at best if this were to be continued, it is a
full Commission matter, it probably would be mid to late
February of 2002. Just so that parties are aware, that is kind
of the current state of affairs at this moment.

COMMISSIONER JABER: If those dates were not reserved for something else. Do all of the parties agree with the motion for continuance?

MR. EDENFIELD: I have no objection to it, but I just want to make sure -- you know, BellSouth has a pending 271 application, and I just want to make sure that by agreeing to this continuance that I am in no way prejudicing that docket, and that nobody is going to raise this continuance and the postponement of these issues as something against BellSouth in that docket. I just want to kind of get a general consensus that I'm not agreeing to something that somebody is going to come back and haunt me with later.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Melson, I think
Mr. Edenfield is asking for your commitment not to raise this
in the scheduling of the 271 matter.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner, I had not thought about the interplay between this docket and 271. There is at least one issue in this docket that may have some relationship to 271, which is the -- what I call the tandem interconnection

issue, because I think it has been WorldCom's position elsewhere in 271 dockets that until that tandem interconnection issue is settled appropriately that BellSouth is not providing interconnection in compliance with the Act. And I guess as I sit here today, on behalf of WorldCom I can't agree to waive that issue, although I'm not sure that is something that could not be, at least for BellSouth, addressed in the context of the 271 proceeding.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Caswell, you wanted to say something?

MS. CASWELL: Yes. I just wanted to point out that Verizon fully supports the motion for continuance. As expressed in our prehearing statement, we believe that it probably is the most prudent approach at this point given the FCC's recent release of its unified intercarrier compensation rulemaking. We believe that that rulemaking will directly affect the issues here. And pushing the hearing out even until mid to late February of next year may be the best approach to give us some opportunity to see where the issues end up at the federal level.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Banks, when are the briefs due? When the declaratory ruling was issued, I know that we directed the parties to submit briefs on the effect of the order. Was it limited to Phase 1?

MS. BANKS: Yes. And those briefs are due June 21st,

which is next Thursday.

1.0

COMMISSIONER JABER: Let me give all the parties notice that I am not going to rule on the motion for continuance today. So that will give you, Mr. Melson, and you, Mr. Edenfield, time to discuss whatever impact you believe you might want to have on 271. But fair warning to the parties, I am not inclined -- the reason I'm not going to rule on the motion for continuance today is I'm not inclined today to grant the motion for a continuance. I want to go back and look at the Commission calendar.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Jaber, in that regard there is a pending motion in the Sprint/Verizon phase of the UNE docket that if granted would potentially free up some dates in late July.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Right. There are many things to consider. One of the things, though, that I want to tell the parties that I will be considering in all fairness to staff is the effect that these continuances have on our staff work load. It creates a domino effect on cases. When we push back cases at your request, whether it be for travel considerations or FCC decisions, it has a long-lasting effect on staff work load. It is a domino effect.

And I think that you are not appreciative of that because you are not seeing the internal happenings of the agency, but I have to be conscious of that. So that will weigh

heavy on my mind and my decision. I will also note that this 1 2 case has been scheduled for July 5th and July 6th for guite 3 some time. So with respect to travel considerations, you 4 should have taken that into account awhile ago. 5 Saying all of that, I will take it under advisement. 6 And in the prehearing order or before, we will issue a decision on the motion for a continuance. 7 8 MR. MELSON: Thank you. 9 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Commissioner, FCCA supports the 10 motion for a continuance. 11 COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you. 12 MR. McGLOTHLIN: You're welcome. 13 COMMISSIONER JABER: Any other preliminary matters 14 before we turn to the draft prehearing order? 15 Mr. Edenfield, did you have something to say? 16 MR. EDENFIELD: Not that it is particularly relevant to your decision, but I was just inquiring, I thought that 17 BellSouth had settled an IDS arbitration that had some dates 18 19 also in July that would not require another case to be moved, 20 but may have opened up some dates. 21 COMMISSIONER JABER: You may have. But the world 22 doesn't revolve just around telecommunications. We have got 23 other hearings in other industries, so I will take all of that 24 into account.

MR. EDENFIELD: I understand. That's why I said it

Our

might not be relevant to your decision. 1 2 COMMISSIONER JABER: Okay. Mr. Moyle. 3 MR. MOYLE: And just so the record is clear, it is my 4 understanding there has not been an actual written motion for a 5 continuance filed, but I guess it is ore tenus on behalf and 6 Global NAPS would join in it. 7 COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you. Let the record reflect unless someone raises their hand and tells me 8 9 otherwise, that the parties, all of the parties concur with the 10 motion for a continuance. 11 MR. EDENFIELD: Pending my working this out with Mr. 12 Melson on this issue of tandem switching, I cannot agree to the 13 motion for continuance until I get that answered. 271 has a --14 COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Edenfield, how do you 15 propose you bring that to our attention? 16 MR. EDENFIELD: I will file a letter as soon as I can 17 get a chance to talk to Mr. Melson. Either today or -- close 18 of business today. I am traveling today back to Atlanta. I 19 will get something by close of business tomorrow, I will have a 20 letter back to the Commission advising them whether I can agree 21 or not, if that is acceptable. 22 COMMISSIONER JABER: That's fine. We will not issue 23 an order until we hear back from you. 24 MR. EDENFIELD: Thank you.

MR. McDONNELL: Commissioner Jaber, I'm sorry.

law firm is not involved in the 271 docket, so the clients we 1 2 represent here we do not represent there, and I am 3 uncomfortable waiving anything that that counsel may have in a 271 docket. 4 COMMISSIONER JABER: So it sounds like Mr. Edenfield 5 has to touch base with all the parties is what you are saying. 6 MR. McDONNELL: Please. 7 8 MR. EDENFIELD: I will do that. 9 COMMISSIONER JABER: Sounds good. All right. ready to move to the draft prehearing order. I don't want to 10 go page-by-page unless we have to. So why don't we --11 MS. BANKS: Commissioner Jaber, I believe that we can 12 start on Page 7. 13 COMMISSIONER JABER: I am assuming there are no 14 changes or concerns with respect to the confidential 15 information section, the post-hearing procedure section, is 16 that correct? No concern with respect to the amount of pages 17 18 in the brief. None from BellSouth. 19 MR. EDENFIELD: COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. Page 7, order of 20 21 witnesses. MS. BANKS: There is one correction which could be 22 inserted at the bottom of Page 7. In Section 6, order of 23 witnesses, it should reflect under each section, the subsection 24 25 labeled rebuttal should include Ed Beauvais, who would be

proffered by Verizon. 1 2 COMMISSIONER JABER: Edward C. Beauvais? 3 MS. BANKS: Yes. And Terry Haynes who would also be 4 proffered by Verizon. COMMISSIONER JABER: This would be a good time to 5 6 discuss if the motion for a continuance is denied, there is a possibility of starting the hearing mid-day July 5th. Would 7 8 that alleviate some of your concerns, Mr. Melson, with respect 9 to travel? 10 MR. MELSON: It would certainly help. 11 COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. And. Ms. Banks. we 12 will take up direct and rebuttal at the same time? 13 MS. BANKS: That is correct, Commissioner Jaber. 14 COMMISSIONER JABER: Is there any objection to doing it that way? 15 16 MR. McDONNELL: In that vein. Commissioner. if I might, William Hunt, III on behalf of Level 3 has requested 17 18 that he testify as late as possible on the 6th if he could be accommodated. Assuming, of course, that the case is not 19 20 continued. He is over on the west coast, Commissioner Jaber, 21 and he is going to have a tough time getting here, and has a conflict early on Thursday. 22 23 COMMISSIONER JABER: Is there any objection to taking 24 up Mr. Hunt in the afternoon of July 6th? All right. 25 MS. BANKS: Excuse me, just a point of clarification.

If I understand correctly, is counsel asking that maybe 1 2 Mr. Hunt be -- we have a place holder for him to come last in 3 the witness list or --COMMISSIONER JABER: Yes. You could put an asterisk 4 next to his name and just indicate that he will be the last 5 witness on July 6th. 6 7 MR. McDONNELL: Thank you. 8 MS. BANKS: Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER JABER: Any other changes to the order of witnesses? All right. Changes to basic position. 10 11 MR. HOFFMAN: Commissioner, before you move forward 12 to the next section, Mr. Moyle and I were discussing a provision that might be helpful for all concerned if the 13 14 hearing moves forward. And that is if we were to move forward on the 5th and 6th, you know, we have already talked about some 15 16 of the travel constraints particularly with folks coming from 17 the western part of the country. Perhaps we could set a 18 deadline for the potential stipulation of any witnesses, 19 whether it is five days or seven days before the 5th, so that 20 they could plan accordingly. 21 COMMISSIONER JABER: That's a good idea. So that you 22

don't -- they don't make travel plans at all.

MR. HOFFMAN: Right.

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER JABER: That's not a bad idea. hate for that to restrict, though, a last-minute stipulation.

We would not want to send a message that last-minute stipulations can't happen.

MR. HOFFMAN: Perhaps we can at least encourage the parties a week in advance if they know that they can stipulate certain witnesses that they advise all parties of such.

COMMISSIONER JABER: I don't think I need to order that. I think that is a very courteous and professional thing to do anyway. So why don't you all read through the testimony as quickly as possible, and get ready as quickly as possible, and call your respective counsels and your clients and see if that request can be accommodated. I think it is a good idea, but I also think you all are professional and you don't need me to order you to do that.

MR. EDENFIELD: I have one question for you. There is an issue -- is it Number 11 that is informational only.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Yes, we are on page 8.

MR. EDENFIELD: Oh, I'm sorry. I was just thinking from an order of witnesses standpoint in stipulating, is it your intention to have these folks come and answer questions from the Commission.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Well, we are going to talk about that. I have a problem with that issue, so we will wait until we get to that. But, no. Any changes to basic positions?

All right, let's talk about Issue 11, then, which is on Page 13. I don't want to skip over any concerns, though.

So if I'm going too fast you need to let me know. 1 2 Issue 11. Staff. I don't want to have an issue that 3 is informational. If I am understanding the way this issue is 4 worded, it doesn't require a Commission vote. 5 MS. BANKS: That is correct. 6 COMMISSIONER JABER: Is there testimony on Issue 11? 7 MS. BANKS: Yes. there is. 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: So the information will be 9 included in the record. 10 MS. BANKS: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JABER: Is this staff's issue? 11 12 MS. BANKS: Yes. I just wanted to note that I 13 believe for the majority of these issues, I believe I can say 14 all of the issues that are in Phase 2 of this proceeding are 15 issues that were submitted by staff and for the purposes of 16 information, just to give staff some idea as pertaining to this 17 particular Issue, Number 11, of the various network 18 architectures. But it is more for information and educational 19 purposes. 20 COMMISSIONER JABER: And the primary witness would be 21 a BellSouth witness, Mr. Edenfield? 22 MR. EDENFIELD: BellSouth certainly filed a witness 23 solely to answer that question. But I think all the parties 24 have probably addressed the issue.

COMMISSIONER JABER: I see Verizon and Sprint.

MS. BANKS: Yes. 1 2 COMMISSIONER JABER: I am inclined to eliminate the 3 I think, you know, in terms of information the 4 information is in the record and staff can include it where 5 appropriate. It doesn't require a vote, and I would hate to 6 start doing this, identifying issues for purposes of 7 information. So, if I understand Mr. Edenfield correctly, this 8 may actually start the ball rolling with stipulating some 9 witnesses. 10 MR. EDENFIELD: That is correct. And I am prepared 11 to handle it any way you would like. I am even prepared to 12 stipulate in -- at least from my standpoint, I am willing to 13 stipulate in everybody's witness on Issue 11, and I assume they 14 would extend the same courtesy to me. 15 COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Caswell, do you want to sit 16 here and have a microphone all the time or -- I see you jumping 17 up and down. 18 MS. CASWELL: Well, I agree with Mr. Edenfield, we 19 could stipulate in everybody's testimony on Issue 11. 20 COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Masterton, do you agree? 21 MS. MASTERTON: Yes. Sprint agrees with that, as

23 COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. McDonnell. 24 MR. McDONNELL: Yes. Commissioner. 25 COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Melson.

22

well.

1 MR. MELSON: Yes. 2 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. COMMISSIONER JABER: Let's drop this issue, Felicia. 3 4 MS. BANKS: Okay. 5 COMMISSIONER JABER: And it sounds like the parties 6 are willing to indicate that Mr. -- is it Tolar? 7 MR. McDONNELL: Yes. ma'am. 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: His testimony, Mr. Jones' 9 testimony, it looks like a portion of Mr. Hunsucker's 10 testimony, a portion of Mr. Hunt's testimony. Would it be 11 easier to just reflect that all testimony related to Issue 11 12 will be stipulated into the record as though read? 13 MS. BANKS: I believe that probably would be most 14 expedient. Thank you. 15 COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Melson. We will reflect 16 that in the prehearing order. Mr. Edenfield, with the 17 understanding that Mr. Tolar, and, Ms. Caswell, with the 18 understanding that Mr. Jones do not have to be at the hearing. 19 MR. EDENFIELD: Thank you. 20 MR. MOYLE: Just so the record is clear, I don't 21 think we would have an objection, but I do need to talk to my 22 client with respect to the stipulation. So, if I could just 23 say that, you know, unless you hear from us by the end of the 24 week with respect to an objection that we would join the

25

stipulation.

COMMISSIONER JABER: By the end of the day tomorrow. 1 2 All right. Any changes to the rest of the issues? 3 MS. BANKS: I don't believe there is a change. Ι 4 believe there may be a possible stipulation on Issue Number 16, 5 and I will defer to Ms. Caswell on that. 6 MR. McGLOTHLIN: If I may respond to that. The FCCA 7 has throughout the case regarded Issue 16 as lending itself to a stipulation either by removing the issue entirely or if that 8 9 is not acceptable, by some substantive wording. We have approached the other parties and some shoulder diplomacy is 10 11 going on. I don't have proposed language that I can say everyone has signed off to, but I wanted to apprise the 12 13 prehearing officer and staff that we are still working on that. COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. And certainly we can 14 leave it into the prehearing order and just have it brought to 15 our attention at the beginning of the hearing if we need to. 16 17 MR. McGLOTHLIN: That would be fine. It is my hope 18 that we can arrive at something prior to that time. COMMISSIONER JABER: Let's do this. Ms. Banks, if 19 20 you receive word that they have actually entered into a stipulation with respect to Issue 16 prior to the issuance of 21 22 the prehearing order, have the order reflect that. 23 MS. BANKS: Okay. Will do. COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. Any other changes to 24 25 any of the issues?

1 MS. MASTERTON: I would just like to note that on 2 Page 25. Sprint's position on Issue 18 from the revised 3 prehearing statement should be inserted into the prehearing 4 order. COMMISSIONER JABER: On Issue 18? 5 6 MS. MASTERTON: Right. 7 COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Banks, do you understand 8 what the change is and can you incorporate it into that issue? 9 MS. BANKS: Yes. If I just could clarify, Ms. 10 Masterton, for Issue Number 18 it should be inserted what is 11 reflected in Sprint's revised prehearing statement? 12 MS. MASTERTON: Correct. 13 MS. BANKS: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER JABER: Any changes to the exhibit list? 14 MS. BANKS: There is one change on Page 30. Under 15 16 rebuttal, witness proffered Ed Beauvais by Verizon should be added under the subsection labelled rebuttal. And the ID 17 number would be E as in Edgar, C as in cat, B as in boy, dash 18 3. And the description is point of interconnection scenarios. 19 20 COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Caswell, is that the only 21 exhibit that was left off? 22 MS. CASWELL: Yes, ma'am. 23 COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Edenfield. MR. EDENFIELD: Commissioner Jaber, also there are a 24

number of exhibits that were associated with testimony on Issue

11. Mr. Tolar had an exhibit identified as NDT-1. I assume those would also have been stipulated into the record along with the testimony, but I just wanted to make sure I was clear on that.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Right. Under the proposed stipulation, Ms. Banks, do this. State that parties have stipulated that all testimony and exhibits related to Issue 11 will be stipulated into the record.

MS. BANKS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JABER: And for the witnesses that were prepared to testify only on Issue 11, indicate that their presence is not necessary for the hearing, that they are excused from the hearing. Is there anything else related to Issue 11 that we should spell out in a stipulation? All right.

There are no pending motions except for the motion for a continuance, which you need to go ahead and indicate under pending motions an oral motion for a continuance.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Commissioner, if this is the appropriate time, there is no written motion, but on behalf of Intermedia, Intermedia participated with the joint ALECs for purposes of stating the position. Intermedia does not sponsor a witness, and Mr. Sapperstein would like to be excused from the hearing.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Yes. There are several requests by parties to be excused from the hearing. Mr. Sapperstein may

be excused from the hearing.

Ms. Banks, wasn't there someone else?

MS. BANKS: Commissioner Jaber, I believe that is the only one that I am aware of at this time. I know that FCTA and XO and KMC have already been excused from the prehearing and hearing. But to my knowledge that is all the parties that have requested excuse.

COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. We should officially then, state that FCTA's request to be excused from the hearing is granted. XO's request to be excused from the prehearing conference was granted. KMC Telecom's request to be excused from the prehearing conference was granted.

MS. BANKS: And if I would just clarify XO and KMC requested excusal from prehearing and hearing.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Oh, and for the hearing? MS. BANKS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Okay. Reflect that that is granted. All right. Opening statements. We did 30 minutes last time. That didn't seem to go very well. It was also very lengthy. But I really want to open this up for discussion, because if parties believe they need 30 minutes per side, certainly we can do that. I was toying with the idea of 20 minutes per side, but I also want to discuss what should be taken up in the discussion of opening statements.

MS. CASWELL: Commissioner Jaber, maybe I can make a

1

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

suggestion. Do any of the parties believe that they need opening statements or the Commissioner? Perhaps we can do away with them.

COMMISSIONER JABER: I don't think the Commissioners have a very strong preference for opening statements.

MS. CASWELL: I didn't think so. And if the parties don't have a preference in this case, perhaps we can do away with them.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Is there agreement there? Thank you. No opening statements in this case. Now that is what staff counsel is going to tell the Chairman, and that is what the Chairman will rely on. All right. Summaries of testimony. In the draft prehearing order it should say five minutes per witness. I am assuming that is still adequate. All right. The next thing I want to get some input on relates to a new section that we added in the prehearing statement related to the impact of FCC decisions and court decisions and what impact they have on PSC proceedings. Apparently Sprint and the Joint ALECs did include some discussion of that in the prehearing statement.

Ms. Banks has taken a stab and created a new section in the draft prehearing order that I think is helpful. But I do know that some of the parties did not include that kind of information in their prehearing statements. I would note that they are not precluded from putting together an official

recognition list, but I want to get some input from you on what you all believe this Section 14 does. Is it helpful, is it confusing?

MS. CASWELL: I didn't know this -- I didn't notice that this section would be in here, but we did discuss these same issues in the context of the specific positions. I do think it is probably helpful in light of all the FCC decisions coming out, the court rulings, to have it set forth in one place. And I would like to point out that Verizon joins with Sprint and the Joint ALECs, particularly with regard to the rulemaking on the unified intercarrier compensation regime. We believe that will affect the proceeding. If you need me to do a revised prehearing statement with a new position that would be fine. Thank you.

attention that new Section K. My intent in starting this was to avoid discussion of these cases for the first time at the agenda conference when the Commission is taking the vote. So this certainly puts everyone on notice that there might be some pending decisions that impact this case going forward, or any other case going forward for that matter. Maybe we should take out, Felicia, the titles of the companies and just say that in the prehearing statements parties reflected the following decisions as having potential impact on the cases.

MS. BANKS: If there is no objection by parties on

the presentation of that, that is fine. They were submitted in the form as presented in the prehearing statements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER JABER: We'll work on some language, and this will change. This is a transitional thing, so it will change. But to the degree you all have ideas and want to pass them on to staff counsel, I would appreciate it.

MR. MOYLE: I don't know if this is the right time to raise this matter, but I know there has been discussion previously with respect to the official recognition list and its impact, import. I have understood that there have been occasions where staff has taken the position that if something was not on the official recognition list then it could not be relied upon in post-hearing briefs. I never, in other context, understood it that way. That it was helpful so everybody could kind of be aware of cases out there that could impact it. And I think that is a good idea both in the pre-prehearing and on official recognition list so long as it didn't act as a preclusion for parties not being able to rely upon or cite some My view is that, you know, it is kind of like precedent. preparing a brief at the Eleventh Circuit, that anything that could be helpful to the person making the decision ought to be in the post-hearing brief.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Ms. Keating, in these new -certainly in the last year with telecom we have started adding
the issue related to jurisdiction. Parties have been on notice

2 a a h

to include discussion of pending FCC or court of appeals cases and how they impact the PSC decision. So it's almost like we have covered all of the bases, but I think Mr. Moyle raises a good point. To the degree there is an order or a court case that hasn't been put on the official recognition list, can parties rely on it in their briefs?

MS. KEATING: Well, Commissioner, and I hope you all can understand me I am a little hoarse today. Quite frankly, there has been sort of an internal debate on the import of the official recognition list and it has gone on for a number of years. It has been my understanding that the prevailing thought has been that orders upon -- that parties are going to use as factual support for their arguments need to be on the list. Things that they believe are dispositive of issues need to be on the list to put other parties on notice that they are going to use those cases.

Anything that essentially presents purely legal argument did not necessarily have to be on the official recognition list. There has also been some debate about whether the Commission orders even really need to be on the official recognition list.

But at least the prevailing thought was that to the extent possible, if parties knew ahead of time what they were going to use, they should put them on the official recognition list particularly in view of the fact that there is a provision

in Section 120 that anything that parties are going to use in that vein other parties need to have the opportunity to respond to. So if you toss it into your brief at the last minute there is really not an opportunity for parties to respond to it. But that being said, there is quite frankly still an internal debate on exactly what that means.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Moyle, we had asked -- the Commissioners in a different hearing asked general counsel to give us his opinion on how to handle that once and for all. And I would suggest Ms. Keating get with Harold, make sure you have a final decision on that before this hearing and let the parties know.

Mr. Moyle, I think what Ms. Keating is trying to say, to the degree you are trying to make your case by citing an order or decision, then you really should include that on an official recognition list because that provides notice to the parties. I think its a notice and fairness issue in that regard. You know, we have got this on-going debate, that is correct, with respect to Commission orders, I still don't see a need to take official recognition of any Commission orders because, you know, they are Commission orders. It seems silly to take official recognition of your own decision. But work that out with Legal, and we will have a final decision by then.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. I guess could I ask the follow-up question, with respect to it being an internal debate and a

Ιt

policy, would it ultimately be promulgated in a rule with 1 2 respect to the Commission? COMMISSIONER JABER: You are just asking too much 3 No, I think we asked Harold McLean to brief us probably 4 today. 5 in something similar to an Internal Affairs. MR. MOYLE: It will be an Internal Affairs or some 6 other mechanism. 7 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: It might be at Internal Affairs, 9 but certainly you all will know. MS. KEATING: Commissioner, if it would be of any 10 assistance to the parties, I can point them to the provision 11 12 that has sort of been the underlying reason for the debate. 13 is 120.569. Subsection 2(i). 14 COMMISSIONER JABER: Are there any other matters that need to come before us at the prehearing conference? 15 16 MS. BANKS: Commissioner Jaber, if I could, please. 17 I guess in the same vein of the discussion with the official 18 recognition list, staff would like to request that parties 19 submit their list to us, and maybe we can put it in one complete composite exhibit, official recognition list. 20 21

And if parties are in agreement to do this, staff would like to request that the official recognition list be submitted to us maybe a week prior to hearing if that is possible. Which according to my calendar that would be Thursday, June 28th.

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER JABER: And you would distribute it to the parties or do they need to distribute it?

MS. BANKS: Staff would take the responsibility of distributing it, if they will submit it to us.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Melson, I am recalling the discussion at the Nocatee hearing with respect to official recognition. Do you remember anything else coming up? I thought that Mr. McLean was going to prepare something and get back to everyone, and I thought we said Internal Affairs.

MR. MELSON: I'm not sure you said where, you sort of directed him to get back with you. I was looking at the evidence code just now. And as I read it, at least Florida decisional law, and it is unclear to me whether that would include Commission decisions, are entitled to official recognition. There is no provision for notice or anything else.

So at least with regard I would think to Florida court decisions it is absolutely clear with respect to your own decisions, it is probably almost as clear that you would not need to officially recognize those. When you move to decisions of the FCC and other states, it probably gets a little fuzzier.

I have always felt, though, that to the extent you are citing them as legal precedent that that was fair game for the briefs whether they had been officially recognized or not. And, frankly, while there is an advantage to doing your

1	homework in advance of the hearing, in the real world sometimes
2	homework doesn't get done until the brief is being written.
3	And I would hate to see anything that would preclude parties
4	from citing to applicable decisions simply because they had not
5	got them on an official recognition list.
6	COMMISSIONER JABER: Right. We will have an answer
7	for you before this hearing, because it is an issue that comes
8	up a lot, and it's time to just resolve it once and for all.
9	So, anything else?
10	We will get you a decision on the motion for
11	continuance as soon as possible so that you can adequately
12	prepare one way or the other. Mr. Edenfield, you will let us
13	know by the close of business tomorrow whether you have an
14	objection or not?
15	MR. EDENFIELD: Yes, ma'am.
16	COMMISSIONER JABER: All right. This prehearing is
17	adjourned. Thank you.
18	(The prehearing concluded at 10:15 a.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	J J
1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	COUNTY OF LEON)
4	T JANE SAUDOT DDD OLI S EDGO D
5	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, FPSC Bureau of Reporting FPSC Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically
7	reported the said proceedings; that the same has been
8	transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel
11	connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	DATED THIS 25TH DAY OF JUNE, 2001.
13	
14	The Turn
15	JANE FAUROT, RPR FPSC Division of Records & Reporting
16	Chief, Bureau of Reporting (850) 413-6732
17	(300), 120 0/02
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	