BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 3 In re: Petition by MCI Telecommunications Corporation for an order requiring Docket No. 970172 BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. to remove its deregulated payphone investment and associated expenses from its intrastate operations and reduce the Carrier Common Line rate element of its intrastate switched access charges by approximately \$36.5 million as required by the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. 10 In re: Petition by MCI 11 Telecommunications Corporation for Docket No. 970173-TP an order requiring GTE Florida, Incorporated to remove its deregulated payphone investment 13 and associated expenses from its intrastate operations and reduce 14 the Carrier Common Line rate element of its intrastate switched access charges by approximately \$9.6 million as required by the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. 17 18 In re: Establishment of Docket Ho. 970281-TL intrastate implementation 19 requirements governing federally mandated deregulation of local : 20 exchange company payphones. 22

21

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS:

DATE:

PREHEARING CONFERENCE

Wednesday, July 30, 1997

BCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

1	I	
1	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK Prehearing Officer
2	100	
3	TIME:	Commenced at 9:30 a.m. Concluded at 11:40 a.m.
4		
5	PLACE:	Florida Public Service Commission Room 152
6		2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida
7		
8	REPORTED BY:	JOY KELLY, RPR Chief, Bureau of Reporting
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		10*7
24		
25		

APPEARANCES:

MANCY B. WHITE, Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company, 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf Bell South Telecommunications, Inc.

Post Office Box 110, MC7, Tampa, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of GTE Florida Incorporated.

CHARLES J. REHWINKEL, P. O. Box 2214,
MCFLTLH00107, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, on behalf of
Sprint-Florida, Incorporated.

J. JEFFRY WARLEN, Ausley & McMullen, Post
Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing
on behalf of ALLTEL Florida, Inc., Northeast Florida
Telephone Company, Inc., and Vista-United
Telecommunications.

DAVID B. ERWIW, Young, van Assenderp and Varnadoe, P. A., P. O. Box 1833, Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1833, appearing on behalf of Florala Telecommunications, Frontier Communications of the South, Inc., Gulf Telecommunications, Indiantown Telephone System, Inc., Quincy Telephone Company and St. Joseph Telecommunications.

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

TRACY HATCH, AT&T Communications of the Southern

States, Inc., 101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700, Tallahassee,

Florida 32301, on behalf of AT&T Communications of the

Southern States.

P. O. Box 6526, Tallahassee, Florida 32314, on behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation.

ANGELA B. GREEN, 125 South Gadsden Street,
Suite 200, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1525, on behalf of
Florida Public Telecommunications Association.

MARTHA CARTER-BROWN and WILLIAM P. COX, Florida

Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the

Commission Staff.

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(Hearing convened at 9:30 a.m.)
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Call the prehearing to
4	order. Please read the notice.
5	MR. COX: Pursuant to notice dated July 16,
6	1997, this time and place have been set for a
7	prehearing conference in Dockets 970172-TP, 970173-TP
8	and 970281-TL.
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll take appearances.
10	MR. MELSON: Richard Melson, Hopping Green
11	Sams and Smith, P.A, P. O. Box 6526, Tallahassee,
12	appearing on behalf of MCI Telecommunications
13	Corporation. Also appearing with me at the hearing
14	will be Thomas K. Bond and Michael J. Henry of MCI in
15	Atlanta.
16	MS. WHITE: Nancy White, BellSouth
17	Telecommunications, 150 West Flagler Street, Miami,
18	Florida, and appearing at the hearing with me will be
19	Phil Carver.
20	MR. GILMAN: Tony Gillsan on behalf of GTE
21	Florida Incorporated, One Tampa City Center, Tampa,
22	Florida.
23	MR. WAHLEN: Jeff Wahlen of the Ausley and
24	McMullen law firm, P. O. Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida
25	32302, appearing on behalf of ALLTEL Florida, Inc.

1	Vista-United Telecommunications and Northeast Florida
2	Telephone Company, Inc.
3	MR. HATCH: Tracy Hatch, appearing on behalf
4	of AT&T, 101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700,
5	Tallahassee, Florida. Also appearing with me will be
6	Mark Logan of the Bryant, Miller & Olive law firm.
7	MS. GREEN: Angela Green on behalf of the
8	Florida Public Telecommunications Association, 125
9	South Gadsden Street, Suite 200, Tallahasse, 32301.
10	MR. REHWINKEL: Charles Rehwinkel on behalf
11	of Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, 1313 Blairstone Road,
12	Tallahassee, Florida 32301.
13	MR. ERWIN: I'm David B. Erwin, of the firm
14	of Young, van Assenderp & Varnadoe, 225 South Adams
15	Street, Tallahassee, appearing on behalf of Quincy
16	Telephone, St. Joseph Telephone and Telegraph, Flora
17	Telephone Company, Gulf Telecommunications and
18	Indiantown Telephone System and Frontier
19	Communications of the South.
20	MR. COX: William Cox and Martha
21	Carter-Brown and Charles Pellegrini on behalf of
22	Commission Staff.
23	COMMISSIONER CLARE: Mr. Cox, do we have
24	anything I have to take up preliminarily?
25	MR. COX: Yes. Commissioner Clark,

initially we'd like to actually adjourn for an onehour period to address some negotiations that have 2 been going on for some time now. 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Tet me ask a question: Do I have to rule on the Motion to Accept 5 Late-filed Prehearing Statement, or should that just 7 wait, too? MR. COX: We can take that up when we come 8 back, or we could take it up now if you'd like. 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sounds good. We will 10 11 adjourn until 10:35. 12 (Recess taken.) COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll call the 13 14 prehearing back to order. Mr. Cox. MR. COX: Just one second. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. (Pause) 16 MR. COX: Commissioner Clark, there are two 17 preliminary motions. The first one I'm going to take 18 up is a motion filed, I believe, today by Florida 19 Public Telecommunications Association to accept their 20 late-filed prehearing statement. Staff has no 21 objections to their motion. 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are there any 23 objections to the late-filed prehearing statement?

We'll accept the late-filed prehearing statement.

1	MS. GREEN: Thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Never again though,
3	Ms. Green. (Laughter)
4	MS. GREEN: It won't be again on my part.
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sure this wasn't
6	either. Mr. Cox.
7	MR. COX: There's also a motion filed by
8	S rint-Florida for reconsideration of the order that
9	you issued in this docket regarding their status in
10	the docket. Staff would request we take that up at
11	the end because we feel that if a stipulation can be
12	reached, that that motion may become moot.
13	MR. REHWINKEL: I agree with that,
14	Commissioner.
15	MS. BROWN: And now, Commissioner, I think
16	we're ready to go through the Prehearing Order, unless
17	the parties have any other preliminary matters. And
18	when we get to Issue 1 we can start dealing with some
19	of the discussions we have had about agreements.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Shall we go
21	right to Issue 1 then?
22	MS. BROWN: If the parties choose.
23	MR. COX: Excuse me. There is one
24	correction. The FPTA was incorrectly listed
25	throughout the prehearing order as the "FCTA" and it
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	
1	needs to be corrected to "FPTA."
2	MR. REHWINKEL: I have a correction to make
3	to my basic position, if we can put that on the
4	record.
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go ahead.
6	MR. REHWINKEL: About two-thirds of the way
7	down in our basic position on Page 10 there's a
8	sentence that starts "no rebuttal testimony."
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Hold on. That's not
10	where I have your
11	MR. REHWINKEL: Oh, I'm in a
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't show Sprint on
13	Page 10 at all.
14	MR. REHWINKEL: You may have a previous last
15	version of the
16	(Counsel hands document to
17	Commissioner Clark.)
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go ahead,
19	Mr. Rehwinkel.
20	MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you, Commissioner.
21	About two-thirds of the way down where it
22	starts off "no rebuttal testimony," at the end of that
23	sentence, before the period, it should say "regarding
24	Sprint-Florida."
25	COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. Anything else?

MR. REHWINKEL: Not on that, no.

MR. WAHLEN: Commissioner Clark, I think
we're going to get to it in a minute. There's been a
considerable amount of discussion on a stipulation
that would take the small companies out of the case
basically. And if that happens, we would need to
eliminate Harriet Eudy as a witness, and probably
revise the basic positions of the small companies to
say --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Are there any other matters that don't hinge on dealing with the stipulation that we should take up? All right. Then let's go to Issue 1.

MS. BROWN: Commissioner, the first thing we need to deal with in Issue 1 is because we have several different parties and different numbers involved in that issue, in the Prehearing Order we would like to divide it up into 1A, 1B, 1C, identifying each company with a different letter so if we have reached an agreement with one and not with another we can show that.

me. Is that acceptable to the parties? Okay.

MS. BROWN: And, Commissioner, now I think Mr. Wahlen and Mr. Erwin would like to explain to you the agreement that we have reached with respect to Issue 1 and the small companies.

MR. ERWIN: Mr. Wahlen is going to explain all of this so that we can save some time. He's speaking for me, too, as far as he speaks.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

MR. WAHLEN: He says that now. He may change his mind. (Laughter)

We have worked diligently with Staff and the other parties to reach a stipulation that we think resolves all of the issues in this case as to the small companies and the basic terms of the entire deal are as follows. The annual subsidy amounts for the small companies are as follows: Vista-United is 234,900; ALLTEL is 66,600; St. Joseph is 25,740; Quincy is 10,980; Gulf is 9,900; Indiantown is 5,760, Northeast is 7,020; Frontier is 1,980 and Florala is 1,080.

With the exception of Quincy and Indiantown, these subsidy amounts will be eliminated by the small LECs via intrastate switched access rate reductions effective April 15, 1997.

Indiantown and Quincy's subsidy will be eliminated in accordance with the Commission's decision on Issue 3.

1	To the extent that a small LEC is required
2	to reduce intrastate switched access rates on or
3	before October 1, 1997, by 5%, the rate reductions
4	made to eliminate the subsidy in this docket will be
5	considered to be a part of, rather than in addition
6	to, the 5% rate reductions required by the statute.
7	If the small LEC is required to reduce
8	intrastate switched access rates by 5% on or before
9	October 1st, 1997, the tariff changes necessary to
LO	make the required rate reductions to eliminate the
11	subsidy in this docket shall be made in accordance
12	with the time schedule in Order 97-0604-FOF-TP.
13	Otherwise, the tariff filings shall be made no later
14	than 30 days of the final order in this case.
15	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. In my Prehearing
16	Order I don't have Frontier listed with a letter. Are
17	they in there and I've just missed them?
18	MR. COX: In Staff's position.
19	MS. BROWN: Commissioner Clark, look on
20	Page 16. You see the list of companies there?
21	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah. They didn't take
22	a position on they are not otherwise listed.
23	MR. COX: Commissioner Clark, they did not
4	file a prehearing statement in this.
25	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MS. BROWN: Commissioner Clark, the way I envision memorializing this is in the Prehearing Order at positions for the issues that are involved, as well as in the stipulation section. So the parties will have -- and the Commissioners will have an opportunity to see exactly what it's going to say.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: And it will be moved to the stipulation section and at the beginning of the hearing we'll take a vote on the stipulations?

MS. BROWN: Yes. Now, I do think we need to go through with each of the parties to get their position on Issue 1. I'm uncertain in every case just what that position is. And that is important to indicate whether we have a full stipulation or not. But I did intend to then memorialize this in the stipulation section.

Also when we're done with that, we need to discuss an agreement from the small LECs to stipulate the interrogatory responses that they filed in response to Staff's interrogatories in order that the Commission will have a record basis to approve the stipulation.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: I'm a little confused.

I thought they had just given their position, at least the small companies, on the issues, and that it would

1	be reflected as a stipulation on the subparts with
2	respect to those companies.
3	MS. BROWN: Well, we have the other parties
4	here as well: MCI, Bell, GTE, AT&T and Sprint, who I
5	think need to
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Maybe I'm confused.
7	Are you suggesting the small companies would be taking
8	a position on those?
9	MS. BROWN: The other parties.
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. But we have
11	a stipulation with respect to the small companies and
12	we're not going to go through them. We're going to go
13	through BellSouth.
14	MS. BROWN: We need to have the other
15	parties weigh in on their agreement.
16	COMMISSIONER CLARK: By "other parties" you
17	mean BellSouth, Sprint, okay.
18	MS. BROWN: So I think we need to go through
19	Issue 1 and get every party's position on Issue 1.
20	MR. WAHLEN: Would it simplify things if we
21	just heard from the parties whether the proposal I
22	just recited is acceptable or not objectionable, and
23	if that is the case, that would be reflected in the
24	stipulation section, and then
25	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Does anyone object to

those stipulations? Mr. Hatch.

MR. HATCH: Let me ask one question of Mr. Wahlen before I do that. Did I understand you when you read your stipulation that those subsidy -- and I'm assuming the subsidy numbers are correct -- that the reductions would go to switched access charges?

MR. WAHLEN: With the exception of Quincy and Indiantown, which will be disposed of in accordance with the Commission's decision on Issue 3, but the other swall LECs will make switched access charge rate reductions.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Anything else?

bit. It would appear that BellSouth has proposed to do their subsidy in a way other than through switched access charges. And if that position should be sustained at the end of the proceeding, then Indiantown and Quincy would not be obliged to make their reduction on switched access charges because the Commission would not have proposed a particular manner or element for the reduction to take place in. So we're going to basically -- the bottom line is we do whatever BellSouth does in this case.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Mr. Hatch.

MR. ERWIN: I think that states what the essence of the agreement was with the Staff.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Hatch.

MR. HATCH: That's fine.

parties -- or show the stipulation between the parties and the Staff and no objection by other parties to the case.

MR. REHWIMKEL: Yes, Commissioner, just to make sure on behalf of Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, we take no position, which means that we would not enter into a stipulation, but we would not contest it as a party.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right.

Prehearing Order, there's two options. If the Commission would like to have a position on each of these issues for all of the small companies, the position could be "see stipulation." Otherwise, my recommendation would be to simply take the position that these items -- say all of these issues have been stipulated by the small companies and not reflect a position for them under each of these issues.

MS. BROWN: That's really fine. And we can work with the parties to come up with what is the best

way to show this.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: All right. So that leaves us with --

MS. BROWN: GTE, Sprint and Bell.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's start with Bell.

MS. BROWN: My understanding, Commissioner, is that we don't have any agreement with respect to Bell on the numbers at this time.

MS. WHITE: No, wa don't. And I guess
Bell's concern with Issue 1 is that Staff has put
forward a figure on Page 16 for BellSouth as the
amount of the subsidy that BellSouth contests and is
different from what BellSouth has put forward. And
BellSouth's concern is that apparently Staff is not
going to have a witness for BellSouth to cross about
the methodology and the calculation of that particular
number. So we're kind of at a loss as to how that
number is going to be put in the record and supported.

MR. COX: Staff's position is that we plan to contest the number of BellSouth through cross examination of their witness, and that's where Staff stands at this point.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Let me ask a question.

Does BellSouth take the position that there is no
subsidy?

MS. WEITE: No. BellSouth takes the position that the subsidy for BellSouth is \$6,501,000.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Oh, all right. And Staff's position?

MS. BROWN: Commissioners, let me get to that. Staff's preliminary position, I might point out, pursuant to -- as it's stated in the Prehearing Order -- hold on just a minute -- \$7,502,000. That is a preliminary position, and I would refer BellSouth also to the South Florida Natural Gas case where we don't necessarily have to put on a witness in order to take a position and conduct cross examination on a particular matter.

MS. WHITE: Well, I'm not questioning
Staff's right to cross examine BellSouth's witness. I
guess what I'm contesting is the fact that Staff's
preliminary position -- there's nothing that BellSouth
can go cross examine on where they got that position,
who is going to support that position, how that number
was made up, how it was calculated. BellSouth can
cross -- I mean Staff can cross BellSouth's witness on
BellSouth's number and contest BellSouth's number but
if Staff is going to put forward a specific number, it
seems to me that Staff has to put forward a witness to
support it and whom BellSouth can cross.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Well, you know, they could put forth no position at all.

This is a battle we've fought ever since I have been here. This is to give you an idea where they are coming from. It is preliminary in nature. Their job is to investigate on our behalf. They are not a party. And they are going to have to put in the record the evidence they need to support whatever position they come up with. And I don't think they are required to put on a witness.

MS. WHITE: Well -- and I understand that, and I guess it just starts to look more like a party when they put forward a specific number.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would you rather not know any number?

MS. WHITE: If they are not going to put forward a witness, I mean, now we know the number, but I'd just as soon have them say "no position."

back and forth on this numerous times. And we finally came to the conclusion it's better to sort of give you a preliminary position as far as where Staff is coming from and -- with the understanding that it depends on what comes out of the hearing.

MS. WHITE: I understand. And I just wanted

to make --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: If BellSouth wants to take the position that Staff should take no position and you have no clue as to where they are coming from, that's okay with me, too.

MS. WHITE: BellSouth doesn't want to take that position, but BellSouth did want to make the Commissioner aware that we have this problem with the Staff position.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: I appreciate that,
Nancy, and it's --

MS. WHITE: It's just a little awkward.

COMMISSICAER CLARK: Yes, it is. But we're doing the best with it being awkward.

I guess we've gotten off on a tangent, and I appreciate your frustration with having that number, but is there anyone -- I assume -- let me back up.

The issues are going to be -- 1A is the subsidy issue with respect to BellSouth. All right. And Staff has taken their preliminary position. What about the other parties?

MR. GILMAN: Commissioner Clark, I think there may be a stipulation with respect to GTE.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me back up. I wanted to know if there were any party positions on

BellSouth's number on that issue.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Clark, MCI would take the position the amount of BellSouth's intrastate subsidy is no less than 6,501,000, no more than 7,502,000 (laughter) and we'll brief based on whatever the evidence shows at the hearing. Seriously, we're not presenting evidence, but --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I guess are you taking no position, or are you taking a position that it's between those two numbers?

MR. MELSON: At this point I'm taking a position it's between those two numbers.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Is anyone else taking a position on 1A?

MR. HATCH: With respect to AT&T, we find ourselves in the same boat as MCI. We don't stipulate or agree with BellSouth's number. Certainly we're more inclined to the Staff's number, but we have not quantified ourselves yet what we truly believe that number is.

Now, you can say that's either no position or however you want to characterize it, but that's essentially it. And until we have completed cross examination and the rest of our investigation in this case, we can't tell you a number, even within a particular range, really.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: All right. So your position as stated on Page 15 is the correct one at this time.

MR. HATCH: Yes.

MS. GREEN: The FPTA is in the same position as what Mr. Hatch described for AT&T, and that is -well, maybe slightly different. We would agree it's at least as much as proposed by BellSouth, but until we finish our cross examination and reach the end of the hearing, we don't know what the final number would be.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What about FPTA?

commissioner CLARK: All right. Then your position has changed. The subsidy amount is at least as much as indicated by BellSouth, but your final position awaits completion and review of discovery in the dockets.

mean, that is everybody. I mean everybody is really in that kind of a position on anything that's fact-driven.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. I'm just trying to get -- with respect to 1A, the parties that have a position are FellSouth, AT&T, MCI, FPTA and then the

Staff; is that correct? Okay.

MS. BROWN: Commissioner, I'm not clear what MCI, AT&T and FPTA's position is.

We were having a discussion earlier about
the necessity of parties to take positions at the
prehearing conference, and I don't know that -- I'm
not certain how I feel about taking a position that is
within a range, because Staff has presented a
preliminary position of a number for the parties.
Then to back off and say, "Well, I guess now we don't
really know whether we have a position or not," I
think they have an affirmative obligation to do more
than that at this point, and to take some sort of a
position on this, and I'm not sure that the hedge is
sufficient.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Let me leave pending the AT&T, MCI and FPTA with respect to BellSouth.

It's my understanding that we will at least go to hearing on that issue with respect to BellSouth. So I think the parties can take no position at this point because it hasn't become a moot issue.

Let's go to GTE and then Sprint, because I think if there's agreement between Staff, if there's agreement between the parties who were -- who had positions on the issues, then taking no position, in

my view, eliminates the issue. But let's go to you, Mr. Gillman.

MR. GILMAN: The Staff, in their position, has taken the position that there's no subsidy for Florida, and, of course, we agree to that. That's consistent with ours. And it's my understanding that there may not be any objections to stipulating that the subsidy for GTE is zero in this case.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there any objection to that? All right. Then we can move that to the stipulation section. Sprint of Florida.

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner Clark, subject to the issues that we've raised that we have put off to the end of the prehearing conference, if necessary we have the same position that GTE does, that we have no subsidy and if there are no objections, the issue ought to be considered stipulated as to Sprint-Florida.

MS. GREEN: I would like to ask

Mr. Rehwinkel a question. Is it that you have no
subsidy left, or you had a subsidy of approximately

\$1.5 million, which you've taken care of through your
filing? And I think that's an important distinction.

MR. REHWINKEL: I can answer that question.

- 1	
1	The filing that we made was made under a time
2	constraint that we meet with the best information
3	available at the time. We made a reduction on what
4	our preliminary calculation showed the subsidy to be.
5	Subsequently, we have revised based on more accurate
6	information and the methodology we understand is to be
7	used, which shows no subsidy. So that's how
8	there's that apparent discrepancy there.
9	MS. GREEN: FPTA has no problem as
10	clarified.
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. So Sprint will
12	be moved to the stipulation.
13	MR. ERWIN: I just need one clarification
14	there on the record, and that is that even though
15	Sprint has now determined that there's no subsidy,
16	they have no intention of going back and revising
TELEX	that
17	MR. REHWINKEL: That is correct,
18	
19	Commissioner.
20	MR. GILMAN: Commissioner Clark, this may go
21	to the other issues, but since there is no subsidy,
22	then there would be no rate reductions required to be

MI. GREEN: No, I would not agree to that.

made under this docket. That would be part of the

stipulation as well?

24

No reductions required to be made as a result of this proceeding or the stage we're at. 2 MR. GILMAN: I said "this docket." 3 MS. GREEN: There's a docket that needs to 5 remain open so --MR. GILMAN: "This proceeding" would be 6 7 fine. COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. All right. 8 Let's go back to the BellSouth just for a minute, and, Ms. Brown, you're concerned about the positions MCI 10 and FPTA want to take. 11 As I understand it, AT&T's position is the 12 same. Will you provide a position on completion of 13 your review on the discovery in this case? MR. HATCH: Commissioner Clark, this may be 15 something that gives you no comfort at all, but my position, if you want it to be more precise, it's at 17 least as big as what BellSouth has proffered. 18 Now, further investigation and cross 19 examination and the record in this case may well 20 determine that that number is not what BellSouth has 21 proffered. That is the problem in picking a number. 22 I haven't quantified what that is going to be. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me back up. I want 24 a position articulated from AT&T, FPTA. And, MCI, 25

you've given it to me. Do you have to repeat it? MR. MELSON: I can. The amount of 2 BellSouth's intrastate subsidy is no less than 3 6,501,000 and no more than 7,502,000. 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Ms. Brown. 5 MS. BROWN: You want Staff's position? 6 Staff's position on this --7 COMMISSIONER CLARE: Do you have a problem B with them taking that position? 9 MS. BROWN: Yes, but I won't say any more. 10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, it seems to me on 11 this issue we're coing to hearing. If you reach a 12 stipulation with BellSouth between then and now in the 13 hearing, then it will be up to them to object and be 14 prepared to present evidence if they want to move 15 forward with it. 16 MS. BROWN: I'm just curious to know if 17 Staff had taken no position at this time in this 18 prehearing matter as BellSouth indicated they wished, 19 what AT&T and MCI's position would have been then. 20 That's my concern. 21 MS. GREEN: Well, I think our positions 22 would be that that is at least the amount of the 23 subsidy, and that a hearing is based on disputed

issues of material fact. If there aren't disputed

1	issues of material fact, there's no reason to even be
2	going forward with the hearing. I mean, that was the
3	purpose of the cross examination is to test the
4	veracity we haven't had depositions, we haven't had
5	an opportunity to fully
6	MS. BROWN: You have had the opportunity.
7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just a minute. I'm
8	just trying to get through the Prehearing Order.
9	That's MCI's position on Issue 1A.
10	MR. MELSON: Yes, ma'am.
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: ATET, what is your
12	position?
13	MR. HATCH: AT&T's position is that subsidy
14	amount for BellSouth is no less than 6,501,000.
15	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
16	MS. GREEN: The subsidy amount for BellSouth
17	is no less than 6,501,000.
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. That takes care
19	of Issue 1.
20	MR. REHWINKEL: Just for the record,
21	Commissioner, we would like our position to be shown
22	as Sprint-Florida has no position. I just want to
23	meke sure because
24	COMMISSIONER CLARK: On what?
25	MR. REHWINKEL: On BellSouth.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. That's fine. 1 MS. BROWN: Commissioner, when we get to 2 exhibits and witnesses, Staff would like to mention 3 that we believe we have a stipulation on the interrogatory responses, but we'll wait. 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Wait until the end to 6 support the issues. You have -- have the parties seen 7 the interrogatory responses that you want to have stipulated into the evidence? 9 MS. BROWN: No, not specifically, but we'll 10 certainly get that to them as soon as we can. 11 MR. ERWIN: Can I ask a question? 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You need to come to a 13 microphone. 14 MR. ERWIM: That obviously must relate to 15 the small company numbers that we have just discussed. 16 And it seems to me that's a factual stipulation or a 17 stipulation as to fact; this is the number. 18 Is it the Commission's requirement or desire 19 that you need to have something? These interrogatory 20 responses aren't going to really show a particular 21 precise number that we've agreed to. We have 22 stipulated the fact, I'm just wondering --23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: If you stipulated, why 24

do you need anything in the record? The only thing

that I can suggest to you is that when we do fuel adjustment, we tend to move all of the information into the record that supports the stipulation.

MS. BROWN: Let me explain my concern.

We have proposed an agreement here, the parties have, and Staff has no objection to the agreement, and will before the Commission recommend that it be approved. The Commission will have to approve it and they will need to review it. And in the utmost caution, I want to let them have a record basis for doing that. That was my concern. If no one else is concerned about this but me, then we certainly won't push it. But that was the reason.

MR. ERWIN: It seems to me that the fact that the Commission is going to consider what we have established, and now we want to put some other things in there, which are also facts, maybe they'd like to look at in case they don't like this fact that we have all agreed is the fact.

MS. BROWN: But may I respond? If we get to the agenda on Staff's recommendation that the stipulation be approved, and Commissioner Deason says, "Where did this number come from --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Back up. Aren't we going to convene the hearing and take this

stipulation?

MS. EROWN: We can do it there or we can do it -- we will have a hearing, so we will go --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's my understanding the stipulation will be taken up at the beginning of the hearing.

MS. BROWN: Then that's fine. We are still
in the situation where Staff will recommend that that
st_pulation be approved. And if one of the
Commissioners says, "Where did you get that number?"
I want to be able to have something on the record that
shows where we got that number, or a range and then an
explanation of how we negotiated it.

commissioner clare: Let's not do this. I'm not -- it's always been troubling to me if you have a stipulation why you build a record. There may be other reasons to do it in fuel adjustment because it's an ongoing process.

In this case I would suggest we take up the stipulation at the beginning, and then what Staff might do as preliminary work is alert the other Commissioners that there's a stipulation. If they would like more information as to the numbers support for that, they will provide it, but we're not planning to move that -- the interrogatories into the record.

- 1	1
1	It will just be taking up the stipulation to vote it
2	up or down.
3	MR. ERWIN: I think that's an acceptable way
4	to go about it.
5	MS. BROWN: That's the way we'll do it.
6	COMMISSIONER CLARE: Good. Thank you.
7	Issue 2.
8	MR. COX: Issue 2, I don't believe we have
9	any stipulations on. Staff has no changes to its
10	response at this time. I don't know if the parties
11	have any changes.
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any changes to the
13	positions on Issue 2?
14	MR. WARLEN: We don't need to go through the
15	small company thing again, do we?
16	MR. COX: No.
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Issue 3.
18	MR. GILMAN: Commissioner Clark, and again I
19	don't know how this will affect GTE if we get
20	stipulated out. I mean we will really no longer have
21	a position on any of these issues anymore.
22	MR. ERWIN: Actually I believe on behalf of
23	Indiantown and Quincy with regard to Issue 2, I should
24	probably still have a position; that it is not the
25	FCC's requirement that the Public Service Commission

The state of the s

1	specify a particular rate element.
2	MS. WHITE: Why don't you list ALLTEL?
3	MR. ERWIN: ALLTEL might withdraw or not
4	have a position. They've already decided they are
5	going to do it a particular way. I don't know that we
6	need to do this but
7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: BellSouth, your
*	position remains. GTE of Florida, what was your view,
9	that you didn't need a position on this issue anymore
10	MR. GILMAN: In light of the stipulation, we
11	have no position on it.
12	MR. ERWIN: We'll just take ALLTEL's.
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just a minute.
14	MS. WHITE: Just the wording.
15	MR. ERWIN: Wording is good.
16	COMMISSIONER CLARE: GTE of Florida's will
17	be no position as a result of the stipulation. Okay.
18	Sprint, no change to yours?
19	MR. REHWINKEL: I can go either way on it.
20	Our position is inapplicable, or we can take no
21	position. Whatever the Staff would
22	COMMISSIONER CLARE: It's your position.
23	MR. REHWINKEL: I don't see any reason to
24	change it.
25	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. ALLTEL.

MR. WAHLEN: Well, ALLTEL, and I guess all of the small companies except Quincy and Indiantown, this is no longer an issue because of the stipulation. And you'll have to talk with Mr. Dave about their position.

MR. ERWIM: Their position is now the ALLTEL position, which is no longer a position.

commissioner CLARE: Mr. Erwin, just so I'm clear, ALLTEL and the other smal! telephone companies, with the exception of Quincy and Indiantown, will be as Mr. Wahlen just stated. The position of Indiantown and Quincy will be "If there's a subsidy to be eliminated, the states must determine the intrastate rate elements. However, the FCC order does not specify specific rate elements to be reduced."

MR. ERWIN: That's correct.

MS. BROWN: Commissioner Clark, I just might want to point out that when we get to the end of going through this, and if any of the parties asked to be excused from the hearing because they have reached any settlements, we may need to go back and remove some of these parties' positions from these issues. That was my concern.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: I would presume they are going to come to the hearing and request excusal

when they get the stipulation through. Okay? 1 AT&T. Your position is as stated? 2 MR. HATCH: Yes, ma'am. 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Issue 3. 4 MR. COX: With regards to Issue 3, I believe 5 there's no stipulation that has been reached to this 6 point. Staff has no changes to its position at this 7 time. 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: GTE's position changes 9 to the same as Issue 2, and that's the same for the 10 small telephone companies, with the exception of 11 Indiantown and Quincy. 12 MR. WARLEN: That's correct. 13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Erwin, do you have 14 a position on Indiantown and Quincy on Issue 3? 15 MR. ERWIN: For Quincy it would be if we 16 need to specify something, it would be nonrecurring 17 charges. But the thrust of what I thought we had 18 19 agreed on in Issue 3 is whatever the Commission decides would be appropriate. 20 | 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. MR. ERWIH: And that's it. I don't have 22 23 anything specific for Indiantown other than it wouldn't have to be any particular --COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Erwin, I appreciate 25

i	Ĭ
1	the discussion, but I want some specific language to
2	be memorialized in the Prehearing Order.
3	MS. BROWN: Commissioner Clark, I think this
4	issue is pretty much dealt with in the agreement that
5	has been reached that will be described in the
6	stipulation section, and we can refer to the
7	stipulation section if that works.
8	MR. ERWIN: That's what I had hoped we would
9	do.
10	MS. BROWN: We can do that.
11	MR. ERWIN: Specific language, however, is
12	what I just said for Quincy, and
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: But let me ask this,
14	Mr. Erwin. Staff will put in the stipulation the
15	language read by Mr. Wahlen and your caveat with
16	respect to your two companies, and so that for the
17	positions on these issues we can say "see the
18	stipulation."
19	MR. ERWIN: Correct.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Issue 4.
21	MR. COX: I believe on Issue 4 we have
22	reached an agreement parties would agree to stipulate
23	to. I'll try to present that as best I can, if anyone
24	wants to correct me if I'm wrong.
25	Issue 4 is "If necessary, by what date

should revised intrastate tariffs that eliminate any identified intrastate payphone subsidy be filed?" 2 The stipulation was as follows: If the 3 Commission makes the same decision that it did in the PAA in this docket, the filings that have been made by Sprint-Florida and BellSouth shall remain effective as filed. If the Commission makes a different decision 7 in this docket and a different rate reduction is required by the Commission, the tariff filings for removal of the subsidy should be made within 30 days 10 of the issuance of the final order in this docket. 11 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Show that as the 12 stipulation for Issue 4. 13 MR. WAHLEN: As it relates to everybody but 14 the small companies. 15 MR. COX: That's correct. 16 MR. WAHLEN: The small companies are covered 17 by the --18 MR. COX: By their separate stipulation. 19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's a stipulation of 20 all of the parties. 21 MR. MELSON: Yes. Commissioner Clark, I 22 would just ask whether Sprint-Florida should be 23

referenced in there because I believe we've stipulated

to no subsidy for them and I thought they would

essentially be out of these remaining issues.

ε

MR. COX: That is true. We can remove Sprint-Florida and make it just BellSouth on the first part.

MR. REHWINKEL: That's fine.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. Issue 5.

MR. COX: Issue 5 is -- I believe we also have a stipulation reached on Issue 5. Issue 5, April 15, 1997, the appropriate effective date for revised intrastate tariffs that eliminate any identified intrastate payphone subsidy.

I think we have agreement that if the Commission makes the same decision it did in the initial PAA order in this proceeding, the effective date of those tariffs would have been when they were filed in this case. I believe Sprint's was filed somewhere around the April 15 date and BellSouth's was filed on April 1st. If the Commission makes a different decision and a rate reduction is required, the effective date of the new rate reduction would be April 15th, 1997, per the FCC's order.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any objection? Okay.

MR. COX: Issue 6, I believe we have agreement from all of the parties and Staff to drop this issue. It's a procedural issue that probably

should not have been included. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Now, do we need 2 to go back to the witness list and the exhibit list? 3 MR. COX: Yes. MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner Clark, before 5 we do that, just to deal with that part of the end of 6 the draft Prehearing Order that references pending 7 motions, I guess barring a complete collapse of what 8 we've agreed to here at the hearing I consider this motion to be -- there needs to be no ruling made on it 10 and I would withdraw it. 11 In case something happened and the 12 stipulations were not agreed to, I'd like to renew it 13 at that point in time, but I would consider it 14 withdrawn. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll show it withdrawn 16 at this point but without prejudice to file it at 17 another time if the stipulation does not move forward. 18 MR. REHWINKEL: Yes. Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. How are we going 20 to handle the witnesses? 21

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner Clark, I would like to just ask on behalf of Sprint-Florida if, based on the status of the proceeding at this point in time, if we could at least agree to stipulate testimony in

22

23

or allow it to be withdrawn, either way. I don't know what the parties' preferences are.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me go through it.

Who remains as a witness based on what stipulations
have been reached. Mr. Lohman.

MS. WHITE: Mr. Lohman does.

MR. MELSON: Ms. Reid.

MR. HATCH: Mr. Guedel.

commissioner clark: I would show everyone as a witness and show the issues, but then indicate for Olson, Scobie, Poag, Eudy that they will not appear because of -- if the stipulation is approved they do not have to appear as witnesses. Consistent with what we've done with respect to the interrogatories, I don't see the necessity of putting their testimony into the record.

MR. GILMAN: Is there any way that the witnesses would not have to appear at all that day; if the stipulation doesn't get approved, maybe have it adjourned?

you can check with the Chairman, but it would be my recommendation that those witnesses not be there and ready to go. And that if it does fall through we'll find another date.

WITHESS GILLAN: That would be very good to 1 us. We'd appreciate that. 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You know what you might 3 do, when we're through -- the hearing is next Wednesday. 5 MR. GILMAN: Thursday. 6 MS. BROWN: I'm sorry, Thursday. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: What I would suggest 8 you do is spend the latter part of this week informing 9 the other Commissioners that you've reached a . 0 stipulation. Indicate that unless -- that if they 11 have a problem with the stipulation they need to let 12 us know so that we can have the witnesses there; 13 barring any information from them that they need the 14 witnesses there, we don't plan to have them available. 15 MS. BROWN: We will do that. 16 COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. 17 MR. GILMAN: Commissioner Clark, we're still 18 on the witnesses. This is probably moot but just in 19 case the stipulation doesn't go forward, Mr. Scobie 20 filed rebuttal testimony and he's not listed. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Let's go 22 ahead and list him as filing rebuttal testimony. 23 Consistent with the conversation I had with 24

Mr. Erwin, it would seem to me that we simply wouldn't

1	put their testimony into the record. That the
2	stipulation has been reached and there's no necessity
3	of having that information in the record.
4	MS. BROWN: Yes, Commissioner Clark, that's
5	satisfactory to Staff. Satisfactory to GTE.
6	COMMISSIONER CLARE: And the same would be
7	true of their exhibits.
٤	MS. WHITE: Commissioner Clark, of the three
9	witnesses left Mr. Lohman is the only one with
10	rebuttal testimony, we'd be willing to combine direct
11	and rebuttal at the hearing.
12	COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. That sounds
13	good.
14	MR. COX: Staff that is no problems with
15	that.
16	MR. MELSON: Commissioner Clark, this is
17	probably an exercise in futility since it sounds as
18	though Staff has questions for Mr. Lohman, we would be
19	willing, if the remaining parties were amenable, to
20	stipulate in, to waive cross essentially on the
21	testimony of all of the three remaining witnesses and
22	simply handle it through a briefing process based on
23	that written record.
24	MS. BROWN: Commissioner, Staff needs just a
25	second, but I don't think that Staff is ready to agree

to that. 1 MS. WHITE: BellSouth will not agree to 2 that. We have cross of AT&T's witness and MCI's 3 witness. 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That settles that. But 5 you can always change your mind. 6 MS. WHITE: Ms. Sims can always change her 7 mind. (Laughter) 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You know, we joke about 9 that and it's nice not to have cross examination if 10 you can avoid it, but I want to urge you not -- that's 11 something you need to review your case and make a 12 decision on and don't feel pressured in any way by the 13 Commission not to conduct what you believe is necessary cross examination. MS. WHITE: And I appreciate that. And I 16 have pressured Ms. Sims but she has rebuffed and said 17 we will have a hearing. 18 MR. HATCH: Commissioner Clark, just one 19 minor change to the witness list. I inadvertently failed to identify issues for Mr. Guedel, 1, 2 and 3. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. Mr. Cox or 22 Ms. Brown, is there anything else we need to take up?

do about basic positions in light of all of the

24

25

MR. WAHLEN: I have a question about what we

stipulating that's been done. I guess at this point
the small company positions would be that the
stipulations should be adopted. Whether the
Commission would prefer to leave the basic positions
as they are and let this go on, that's fine with me,
too.

MS. BROFFS: Commissioner, it's really the
parties' choice. We'll certainly put in the

parties' choice. We'll certainly put in the

Prehearing Order for you to sign as what the parties

would like us to put as basic positions. We can work

with them to get the proper language that they would

like. From Staff's perspective we don't care.

MR. WAHLEN: I don't want to be taking a basic position that there's no subsidy and have a stipulation down at the bottom that says there is and have people get confused. I guess, unless Dave disagrees, all the small company basic positions should be that the small company stipulations should be approved.

We do intend to pass a draft of this around to all of the parties for their review.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MS. EROWN: Any changes.

COMAISSIONER CLARK: I think that's the

appropriate way to go, to show it, so that it's your position that the stipulation should be approved. If it does not work out, then you have the opportunity to say, "Well, if you're not approving the stipulation our position is as initially stated."

MR. REHWINKEL: Likewise, Sprint-Florida would be the same, especially in light of the way our position reads today.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So your position is the stipulation should be approved.

MR. REHWINKEL: Yes.

MR. GILMAN: GTE, our basic position is consistent with the stipulation. I'd be inclined to leave ours as is and to maybe add a sentence that it has been stipulated as such. But I think our basic position should stay as is.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: And you can just add a line that says that the stipulation is consistent with your basic position.

MR. GILMAN: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: O'cay. Anything else?

MR. WAHLEN: Only one thing I wanted to say
was that Staff worked very diligently with all of the
small companies and ruined about four fax machines
trying to give everybody notice of all of the meetings

that were held, and it was a very involved process and 1 they drive a hard bargain and we're glad it worked out 2 the way it did. 3 COMMISSIONER CLARE: Thank you, Mr. Wahlen. And let me indicate I appreciate it, too, and I have 5 recently gone over a deposition schedule that -- for 6 the BellSouth. And I appreciate you're working hard. 7 Maybe the public doesn't know it but we know you work awfully hard and I know all the Commissioners 9 appreciate it. And thank you, Mr. Wahlen for 10 mentioning it. 11 MR. WAHLEN! sure. 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Anything else? With 13 that the prehearing is adjourned. Thank you very much. 15 (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 16 11:40 a.m.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF LEON I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of 3 Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 970172-TP, 970173-TP and 5 970281-TL was heard by the Prehearing Officer at the time and place herein stated; it is further CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported 7 the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 46 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. • 10 DATED this 31st day of July, 1997. 11 12 CSR, RPR 13 Chief, Bureau of Reporting Official Commission Reporter 14 (904) 413-6732 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24