

BEFORE THE  
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 960786-TL

In the Matter of

CONSIDERATION OF BELLSOUTH  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S ENTRY  
INTO INTERLATA SERVICES PURSUANT  
TO SECTION 271 OF THE FEDERAL  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE  
A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT  
THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING,  
THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY.

PROCEEDINGS:           PREHEARING CONFERENCE

BEFORE:                COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON  
                          Prehearing Officer

DATE:                   Thursday, September 20, 2001

TIME:                   Commenced at 9:30 a.m.  
                          Concluded 10:30 a.m.

PLACE:                 Betty Easley Conference Center  
                          Room 152  
                          4075 Esplanade Way  
                          Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY:         JANE FAUROT, RPR  
                          Chief, Office of Hearing Reporter Services  
                          FPSC Division of Commission Clerk and  
                          Administrative Services  
                          (850) 413-6732

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

12071 SEP 25 6

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 NANCY B. WHITE, c/o Nancy Sims, 150 South  
3 Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing  
4 on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

5 JOSEPH A. McGLOTHLIN, McWhirter, Reeves,  
6 McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold &  
7 Steen, P.A., 117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee,  
8 Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of the Florida  
9 Competitive Carriers Association, Z-Tel  
10 Communications, Inc. and ACCESS Integrated Networks.

11 VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, McWhirter, Reeves  
12 McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold &  
13 Steen, P.A., 117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee,  
14 Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of KMC Telecom,  
15 Inc., NewSouth Communications Corp., XO Florida,  
16 Inc., NuVox Communications, Inc. and Covad  
17 Communications, Inc.

18 KEN HOFFMAN, Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell &  
19 Hoffman, P. A., 215 South Monroe Street, Suite  
20 420, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1841, and HENRY C.  
21 CAMPEN, JR., Parker, Poe, Adams & Bernstein, L.L.P.,  
22 1400 First Union Capital Center, Raleigh, North  
23 Carolina 27602, appearing on behalf of US LEC of  
24 Florida.

25

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 KORY ICKLER, PETER DUNBAR and KAREN  
3 CAMECHIS, Pennington, Moore, Wilkinson, Bell &  
4 Dunbar, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, 2nd Floor,  
5 Tallahassee, Florida 32301, and HENRY C. CAMPEN,  
6 JR., Parker, Poe, Adams & Bernstein, L. L .P., 1400  
7 First Inion Capital Center, Raleigh, North Carolina  
8 27602, appearing on behalf of Time Warner Telecom.

9 SUSAN A. MASTERTON, Post Office Box 2214,  
10 MS:FLTLH00107, Tallahassee, Florida 32314,  
11 appearing on behalf of Sprint Communications Company  
12 Limited.

13 MATTHEW FEIL, 390 North Orange Avenue,  
14 Suite 2000, Orlando, Florida 32801, appearing on  
15 behalf of Florida Digital Network, Inc.

16 JIM LAMOUREUX, 1200 Peachtree Street, N.  
17 E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309, appearing on behalf of  
18 AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.,  
19 AT&T Broadband Phone of Florida, LLC and TCG South  
20 Florida, Inc.

21 NORMAN H. HORTON, JR., Messer, Caparello &  
22 Self, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701,  
23 Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876, appearing on behalf  
24 of e.spire Communications, Inc.

25

## 1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 RICHARD D. MELSON, Hopping Green Sams &  
3 Smith, 123 South Calhoun Street, Tallahassee,  
4 Florida 32314, appearing on behalf of WorldCom, Inc.

5 DONNA C. McNULTY, Esquire, WorldCom, Inc., 325 John  
6 Knox Road, Suite 105, Tallahassee, Florida and DULANEY L.  
7 O'ROARK, III, Esquire, WorldCom, Inc., Concourse Corporate  
8 Center Six, Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 3200, Atlanta, Georgia  
9 30328, on behalf of WorldCom, Inc.

10 MICHAEL GROSS, Esquire, 246 East 6th Avenue, Suite 100,  
11 Tallahassee, Florida 32303, on behalf of Florida Cable  
12 Telecommunications Association, Inc.

13 HENRY CAMPEN, JR., Esquire, Parker, Poe, Adams &  
14 Bernstein, First Union Capital Center, 150 Fayetteville Street  
15 Mall, S-1400, P.O. Box 389, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602,  
16 appearing on behalf of NuVox Communications and XO  
17 Communications.

18 BETH KEATING, FELICIA BANKS and MARY ANNE  
19 HELTON, FPSC Division of Legal Services, 2540  
20 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida  
21 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Commission  
22 Staff.

23

24

25

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Call the prehearing conference  
3 to order.

4 Could I have the notice read, please.

5 MS. KEATING: By notice issued September 6th, 2001,  
6 this time and place have been set for a prehearing conference  
7 in Docket 960786-TP. The purpose is as set forth in the  
8 notice.

9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you. Take appearances.

10 MS. WHITE: Nancy White for BellSouth  
11 Telecommunications.

12 MS. MASTERTON: Susan Masterton for Sprint  
13 Communications Company, Limited Partnership.

14 MR. LAMOUREUX: Jim Lamoureux for AT&T.

15 MS. McNULTY: Donna McNulty, Rick Melson, and D.  
16 O'Roark representing WorldCom, Inc.

17 MR. GROSS: Michael Gross representing the Florida  
18 Cable Telecommunications Association.

19 MS. KAUFMAN: Vicki Gordon Kaufman of the McWhirter  
20 Reeves law firm representing KMC Telecom, NewSouth  
21 Communications Corp, XO Florida, Inc., NuVox Communications,  
22 Inc., and Covad Communications Company.

23 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Joe McGlothlin representing the  
24 FCCA, Z-Tel Communications, Inc., and Access Integrated  
25 Networks.

1 MR. ICKLER: Kory Ickler, representing Time Warner  
2 Telecommunications, Inc., entering appearances for Pete Dunbar  
3 and Karen Camechis.

4 MR. FEIL: Matthew Feil with Florida Digital Network,  
5 Inc.

6 MR. HORTON: Norman H. Horton, Jr., for e.spire  
7 Communications.

8 MR. HOFFMAN: Kenneth Hoffman on behalf of US LEC of  
9 Florida, Inc.

10 MR. CAMPEN: This is Henry Campen on the phone with  
11 Parker, Poe, Adams & Bernstein appearing on behalf of US LEC,  
12 Inc., Time Warner Telecom, NuVox Communications, and XO  
13 Communications.

14 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry, could you repeat  
15 your name, please?

16 MR. CAMPEN: Henry Campen, C-A-M-P-E-N, Parker, Poe,  
17 Adams & Bernstein.

18 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. And is there someone  
19 else there with you?

20 MR. CAMPEN: No.

21 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. KEATING: And Beth Keating appearing for  
23 Commission staff, also entering an appearance on behalf of  
24 Felicia Banks and Mary Anne Helton.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.

1 Staff, we have preliminary matters?

2 MS. KEATING: Just a few, Commissioner. The first  
3 thing I would like to note is that there is one outstanding  
4 motion at this time. On the 18th, AT&T filed a motion  
5 requesting an investigation into BellSouth's conduct in  
6 processing certain local service requests. The time for filing  
7 responses has not yet run. Staff also does not believe that  
8 this would have a direct impact on the hearing processes  
9 itself, so we would recommend that a ruling be deferred until  
10 responses are received.

11 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Lamoureux.

12 MR. LAMOUREUX: The motion does deal with activity in  
13 the third party testing, which even I would have to agree is in  
14 what we are calling the nonhearing track portion of this  
15 proceeding at this point, so I have no objection to that  
16 recommendation.

17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well.

18 MS. KEATING: The only other thing that is really  
19 pending right now, there are four confidentiality requests that  
20 are pending that pertain to items that will be used at hearing.  
21 Staff is prepared to recommend at this time that those requests  
22 for confidentiality be granted, but we suggest that those be  
23 dealt with by separate order.

24 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. You will give me your  
25 recommendation with a suggested order before the hearing,

1 correct?

2 MS. KEATING: Yes, sir.

3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.

4 MS. KEATING: And the last thing, I don't know if you  
5 would like to take this up now or after you have gone through  
6 the draft prehearing order, but staff has a suggested way of  
7 revising the way the docket is set up to perhaps clarify which  
8 filings are going into the hearing track and which filings are  
9 going into the OSS testing track.

10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let's go ahead and address that  
11 and explain your recommended remedy.

12 MS. KEATING: One of the problems that we have run  
13 into lately is that it is not always real clear which filings  
14 in the docket, which track they are directed to. And we have  
15 worked with Kay Flynn in Records and Reporting to come up with  
16 a way to perhaps alleviate some that confusion. And what we  
17 have come up with is dividing this docket up into subdockets.  
18 There would be 960786A-TL, which would be filings that are  
19 intended for the hearing track, and 960786B-TL, which would be  
20 the OSS testing tract.

21 We planned to -- we would like to go back to the  
22 first of this year and go through and divide the filings up  
23 into these subdockets. We don't really think that it is  
24 necessary to go back further than that at this time point in  
25 time. But from here on out filings would go into the A



1 subdocket for the hearing and the B subdocket for the testing.

2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Now, it would not be necessary  
3 for the parties actually to go back and designate that, we  
4 would do that internally here?

5 MS. KEATING: We would do that internally, yes, sir.

6 COMMISSIONER DEASON: But for future filings, the  
7 parties would indicate either with an A or B as to which  
8 particular section of this docket the filing pertains?

9 MS. KEATING: Yes, sir.

10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Any questions from the parties,  
11 comments, objections?

12 MS. WHITE: I think it's a good idea.

13 MS. MASTERTON: I guess I have a question. So as far  
14 as like the testimony that was stricken from this track, I  
15 mean, how does that fit into what you're talking about going  
16 back to January 1st and redesignating?

17 MS. KEATING: Well, testimony that was designed for  
18 the hearing would be designated with an A. And things that  
19 were designated for the OSS testing track would be designated  
20 with a B. I'm not sure I am exactly --

21 MS. MASTERTON: Because I had understood that we were  
22 to refile those comments as comments in the docket as opposed  
23 to you just redesignating them as B. I guess that is the  
24 question.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me clarify. It is my

1 understanding you would need to refile that and put a B on it.

2 MS. MASTERTON: So for the testimony itself you are  
3 not going to go back and change the designation of --

4 MS. KEATING: No. We would not automatically convert  
5 anything that had been previously filed for the hearing track  
6 to the testing track, yes.

7 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Any other questions? Ms.  
8 McNulty.

9 Ms. McNULTY: Yes. WorldCom thinks that is a good  
10 idea, and we appreciate all of your efforts with that. And  
11 while we are on this topic here, I'm not sure we really  
12 understand how the hearing track and nonhearing tracks come  
13 together for the Commission's recommendation to the FCC, and we  
14 were wondering whether you could provide us some guidance.

15 MS. KEATING: Staff has looked into perhaps doing  
16 some sort of memorandum on that. But I can give you a brief  
17 sketch of what we thought we had tried to be real clear about.  
18 We anticipate the Commission going to hearing on the issues  
19 that the prehearing officer has identified and that the  
20 Commission will address the issues heard at hearing at their  
21 agenda conference and that a final order will be issued. There  
22 will be a separate recommendation and separate order on OSS  
23 testing. Those orders would cross reference each other.

24 It is our intent that the order coming out of the  
25 hearing track would indicate whether BellSouth had passed with

1 regard to the issues addressed, but would note that a final  
2 recommendation to the FCC could not be made pending the outcome  
3 of the OSS testing. And we then contemplate perhaps bringing  
4 to an Internal Affairs an item that would have a transmittal  
5 letter that would ultimately send everything, both orders and  
6 perhaps a reference to the performance measures docket up to  
7 the FCC, but that it would go as a package. There will be --  
8 our idea is that there will be no one order that represents,  
9 you know, everything.

10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask this question. At  
11 the conclusion of both this hearing track phase and the OSS  
12 testing, and the Commission -- how will the Commission  
13 communicate with the FCC and what will we -- will we send it by  
14 a letter, or will we attach orders to the letter, or will we  
15 send a copy of the transcript and all of the exhibits to the  
16 FCC? How will we actually communicate with the FCC?

17 MS. KEATING: Our thought is that the Commission  
18 would do a letter and attach the orders that are relevant to  
19 its recommendation; the order from the hearing, the order from  
20 OSS testing, and perhaps also the order from the permanent  
21 performance measures docket. And the letter would essentially  
22 be a cover letter with its ultimate, you know, sort of a  
23 summary of its findings and with those three orders as an  
24 attachment.

25 MS. WHITE: Just as information, when BellSouth files

1 its case at the FCC, it has to file everything on which it  
2 relies. And that will include transcripts, orders, exhibits,  
3 so we have to do that, not you all.

4 COMMISSIONER DEASON: And you're going to rent a big  
5 truck.

6 MS. WHITE: Pretty much, yes. I think we may be  
7 buying a copying center as a new business to get it done, but  
8 we do have --

9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Is that going to be  
10 structurally separated from your other operations?

11 MS. WHITE: We will look into that and get back to  
12 you.

13 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Ms. McNulty, did that  
14 answer your question?

15 Ms. McNULTY: Yes. Thank you for the clarification.

16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Well, then if there are  
17 no objections to the A and B designations for the various  
18 filings within this docket, we will proceed with that and you  
19 can communicate to the Clerk's Office that that will be the  
20 procedure from here out. And if you don't designate A or B, we  
21 will just throw your filing in the trash. I'm kidding. But  
22 please try to remember it will facilitate matters.

23 Okay. Does that exhaust your list of preliminary  
24 matters?

25 MS. KEATING: Well, there is one other thing that I

1 had thought that Covad was going to bring up with regard to one  
2 of its witnesses, but it may be more appropriate for that to  
3 come up as we are going through the draft prehearing order when  
4 we get to the witness list.

5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. Kaufman, if there is we  
6 will just take it up at that time. Apparently, staff was under  
7 the impression that there may be some withdrawal of some  
8 testimony?

9 MS. KAUFMAN: Okay. That's fine, we can take it up  
10 when we get to it.

11 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Preliminary matters  
12 from the parties? Ms. White.

13 MS. WHITE: We have some issues, but we will just  
14 bring them up as we go through the prehearing order if that is  
15 acceptable.

16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's fine. I will open it up  
17 to any of the other parties. If there are preliminary matters  
18 which you feel need to be addressed before we proceed through  
19 the draft prehearing order, now is your opportunity. Silence.  
20 Very well. That's good.

21 Okay. We have a draft prehearing order which is in  
22 front of us.

23 Persons that are participating via telephone, if you  
24 do have a mute on your telephone, please press it. It is  
25 causing some disturbance here in the hearing room, and

1 particularly for the court reporter. Do you hear me okay? Is  
2 that possible to do?

3 MR. CAMPEN: Yes, Commissioner. This is Henry  
4 Campen. I have heard you and my mute button is going to be on  
5 now.

6 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you.

7 We are going to proceed through the draft prehearing  
8 order. As is customary at least in the prehearing conferences  
9 which I conduct, I plan to proceed rather quickly  
10 section-by-section. It will be incumbent upon the parties, if  
11 you have questions, comments, objections, please let me know.  
12 Otherwise I am going to assume that what is contained in the  
13 draft prehearing order is sufficient and appropriate.

14 Therefore, having said that, perhaps we should  
15 address the -- this is a first -- the appearances. They are so  
16 extensive. Are there any changes or corrections to the  
17 appearance list? Very well. Section I, conduct of  
18 proceedings. Section II, case background. Section III,  
19 procedure for handling confidential information. Section IV,  
20 post-hearing procedures.

21 MS. WHITE: Yes, I do have something on that. The  
22 draft prehearing order says that the briefs shall be no more  
23 than 40 pages. I really wish that would be the case, but I  
24 don't see how it can, so I would ask that that be increased.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. Keating and I are smiling

1 because we had this conversation in my office this morning, and  
2 we had promised that neither one of us were going to raise  
3 that.

4 MS. WHITE: Well, I hate that it's me.

5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: What do you suggest?

6 MS. WHITE: I need to open the door and run when I  
7 suggest this; 100 pages, but I will take 80.

8 (Laughter.)

9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: The bidding has been opened.  
10 Well, Ms. Keating indicated to me, and I will put her on the  
11 spot, that 50 was plenty because we have no extensive legal  
12 argument, or hopefully we don't have. At least we are not  
13 aware at this point of extensive legal argument that is going  
14 to be necessitated by this hearing. And that obviously there  
15 are a lot of substantial factual policy kind of issues which  
16 need to be addressed. Can you live with 50?

17 MS. WHITE: Can we bargain? How about 65.

18 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Any objection to 60?

19 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner Deason, I was going to ask  
20 for 60, so I will take 60.

21 MS. WHITE: Oh, yes, suck up down there.

22 MR. HOFFMAN: US LEC could live with 30.

23 MS. WHITE: Oh, Ken.

24 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Maybe we should do a quick  
25 average of all the numbers which we have just heard.

1 MS. KEATING: 62.5.

2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, do you have any final  
3 thoughts?

4 MS. KEATING: I mean, we are not averse to having 60  
5 or 65, it's just we didn't -- I didn't really think it was all  
6 that necessary. But, you know, it sounds like there is at  
7 least some indication that it should be around 60 at least.

8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We will set the limit at 60.  
9 And just because the limit is 60, you are not obligated to file  
10 60 pages in your brief, but I do think that 60 is sufficient  
11 realizing that if you can focus on the major issues that you  
12 are most likely to have a greater impact it seems to me.

13 Ms. McNulty.

14 Ms. McNULTY: While we are on this section, the draft  
15 prehearing order also contains a provision that says that a  
16 summary of each position should be no more than 50 words. Some  
17 of these issues have subparts, and we are not -- we would  
18 actually request that the 50 words be per subpart, although we  
19 don't intend to take 50 words per each subpart.

20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Any objection to that  
21 clarification, 50 words per subpart? Realizing that you don't  
22 have to write 50 words.

23 MS. WHITE: And you will use up your 60 pages if you  
24 did that.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Show then that we will



1 make that clarification.

2 Ms. McNULTY: Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Anything further on Section IV?  
4 Very well. Section V. I would note that presently the  
5 summaries are to be limited to five minutes. Is that going to  
6 present a problem for any party?

7 MS. WHITE: I hope not.

8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Well, of course, it will  
9 be up to the Chairman, who will be presiding at this hearing,  
10 to enforce that, but you all will be on notice that it is  
11 anticipated that you will keep your summaries to no more than  
12 five minutes.

13 Section VI, order of witnesses.

14 MS. WHITE: Commissioner, on this section we have two  
15 issues. First, we wanted to know whether the parties wanted to  
16 do direct and rebuttal at the same time. If so, then BellSouth  
17 would want to change the order of its witnesses. But I didn't  
18 want to do that before I knew whether the parties were going to  
19 agree to do direct and rebuttal together.

20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: The question has been asked is  
21 there a preference whether we should have direct and rebuttal  
22 taken together.

23 Ms. McNULTY: WorldCom does not object and we would  
24 prefer to do it that way.

25 MR. LAMOUREUX: AT&T would prefer to do them

1 together, as well.

2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That is two votes in your  
3 favor.

4 MS. KAUFMAN: We have no objection.

5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Does anyone have an  
6 objection? There is no objection. Ms. White, I assume you do  
7 not object?

8 MS. WHITE: Right. Thank you. No, we don't object.  
9 We would prefer it, as well. We think it makes the hearing go  
10 a little more efficiently. In that case then, I would want to  
11 reorder my witnesses. And I can either tell you after the  
12 prehearing or I'm prepared to do it now for the parties to  
13 hear.

14 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Why don't you do it verbally  
15 now and go slowly, but then please provide it to staff with a  
16 listing that they can incorporate into the order.

17 MS. WHITE: Okay. Ms. Cox, Cynthia Cox would be  
18 number one. Number two would be Ms. Caldwell. Number three  
19 would be Mr. Pate. Number four would be Mr. Ainsworth. Number  
20 five would be Mr. Latham. Number six would be Mr. Williams.  
21 Number seven would be Mr. Gray. Number eight would be Mr.  
22 Milner. Number nine would be Mr. Scollard. Number ten would  
23 be Doctor Taylor. And number eleven would be Mr. Varner.

24 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Don't we have a limit on the number  
25 of witnesses somewhere?

1 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That may be appropriate. Okay.  
2 Are there other changes to the order of witnesses?

3 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner, this is not a change to  
4 the order, it's more in the nature of clarification. This has  
5 to do with Mr. Fury of NewSouth. I just wanted to be clear  
6 that Mr. Fury filed his own testimony, and in addition to that  
7 he is adopting the testimony of the other NewSouth witness,  
8 Mr. Beasley. And I see there is a footnote there referencing  
9 the adoption, but I just wanted to be clear that he also has  
10 his own prefiled testimony.

11 MS. WHITE: Just as a question, is he going -- are  
12 you going to put him on just once?

13 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes.

14 MS. WHITE: Thank you.

15 MS. KEATING: I could add an also in front of the  
16 footnote on Page 11, if that would help.

17 MS. KAUFMAN: That would be fine. I guess everybody  
18 is on notice now that he essentially has two sets, his own and  
19 Mr. Beasley.

20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. We will clarify  
21 that. I guess I have a question for the parties. There are a  
22 number of witnesses whose testimony and perhaps some of their  
23 exhibits have been stricken, and that is subject to  
24 reconsideration. Are we going to have reconsideration filed?  
25 And the only reason I'm asking, I'm just trying to plan for how

1 we should present this for purposes of the prehearing order.

2 MR. McGLOTHLIN: ACCESS intends to file  
3 reconsideration.

4 MR. LAMOUREUX: AT&T does, as well.

5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well.

6 MS. KAUFMAN: I think that might bring me to Ms.  
7 Keating's reference to Covad's testimony. When I gave her that  
8 look, I wasn't sure what she was referring to, but I believe in  
9 the order striking some of the testimony there appears to have  
10 been an error made as to Covad's testimony. There was a  
11 section that I'm sure was intended to be stricken that was not.  
12 And we had discussed with Ms. Keating the fact that we won't  
13 put our witness on to address essentially one paragraph of her  
14 testimony, and that we would withdraw it. But since Covad also  
15 intends to file a motion for reconsideration, we will not be  
16 withdrawing it at this time.

17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. So we will continue  
18 the designation with the asterisk beside those witnesses for  
19 which testimony, partial testimony has been stricken, and we  
20 will just leave it at that, and the petitions for  
21 reconsideration will be handled in due course.

22 MR. LAMOUREUX: I hate to volunteer this, as well,  
23 but one of our witnesses whose testimony was stricken does not  
24 have an asterisk next to it on the prehearing order.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Such honesty today.

1 MS. MERRITT: I made him do it.

2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Good for you.

3 MR. LAMOUREUX: I think a substantial portion of  
4 Ms. Wheeler's testimony was stricken. And along that lines, I  
5 think everything but her introduction and her background were  
6 stricken. If we are going to strike all the substance of her  
7 testimony, I would just request that we strike the whole thing.  
8 And along those lines --

9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Request granted.

10 MR. LAMOUREUX: I don't want to have to bring a  
11 witness who all the substantive testimony has been stricken.

12 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Fine. But her testimony,  
13 though, will be part of your petition for reconsideration. So  
14 we will continue to list her with the asterisk. But obviously  
15 if all that remains -- depending on how the petition for  
16 reconsideration is addressed -- it would only make sense for  
17 the testimony -- the remaining testimony to be withdrawn and  
18 the witness not to appear.

19 MR. LAMOUREUX: Thank you.

20 MS. KAUFMAN: Mr. Deason, that is the case also with  
21 a number of the other witnesses. For example, XO's Witness Ms.  
22 Campbell for NuVox, so that would be our preference, as well,  
23 depending on how the motion for reconsideration goes. If your  
24 orders stands, then we assume those witnesses will not appear  
25 and their testimony be withdrawn.

1 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well.

2 MS. WHITE: Just from a practical standpoint, I would  
3 like to ask Beth, we are supposed to, per the order, file the  
4 revised testimony I think on the 1st of October, and --

5 MS. KEATING: The 3rd.

6 MS. WHITE: The 3rd of October?

7 MS. KEATING: It's the 3rd.

8 MS. WHITE: Okay. I'm sorry, the 3rd.

9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: You can do yours on the 1st.

10 MS. WHITE: The days are running together. But  
11 you're not going to take out -- I guess, the original testimony  
12 would still be in the record until the reconsideration is dealt  
13 with, so --

14 MS. KEATING: Well, it would be in the docket.

15 MS. WHITE: -- if by some wild chance the  
16 reconsideration succeeded, which I'm sure it won't, but if it  
17 succeeded, the testimony would just go back go to what had been  
18 originally filed?

19 MS. KEATING: If reconsideration was successful,  
20 there would be no need to file anything different on the 3rd.

21 MS. WHITE: Oh, okay. You're thinking there would be  
22 a decision by then?

23 MS. KEATING: We anticipate since the last agenda  
24 conference is the 2nd, before the hearing, if and when motions  
25 for reconsideration come in, we anticipate asking permission to

1 add a late-filed item onto that agenda schedule. We would also  
2 ask, though, that --

3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: You file your petitions as  
4 quickly as possible.

5 MR. LAMOUREUX: It will be tomorrow.

6 MS. KEATING: And that responses, if any, be filed as  
7 quickly --

8 MS. WHITE: If any, we will file them as soon as  
9 possible.

10 MR. LAMOUREUX: And speaking for AT&T, we would have  
11 no objection to having a late-filed addition to the October 2nd  
12 agenda conference. I think that is the last one before the  
13 hearing starts.

14 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Okay. Things are  
15 going so well. Okay. We can now proceed to Section VII, basic  
16 positions. Changes, corrections?

17 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner Deason, I have an  
18 addition, I guess, and that is after BellSouth's position we  
19 have a category there for ALECs, and I thought maybe Ms.  
20 Keating could put a footnote there that designates exactly who  
21 the companies are that are joining in that position, that it is  
22 not every ALEC. Some ALECs have separately stated their  
23 positions.

24 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I think that is in the text of  
25 the order somewhere else. Am I mistaken?

1 MS. KEATING: It is in the case background on Page 6.

2 MS. KAUFMAN: Okay. As long as it's in there, I just  
3 didn't want there to be any confusion. I apologize.

4 COMMISSIONER DEASON: It is the next to last  
5 paragraph --

6 MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

7 COMMISSIONER DEASON: -- of Section II, which appears  
8 on Page 6.

9 Okay. Any other questions with the case background?  
10 I'm sorry, with the basic positions. Section VIII, issues and  
11 positions. Beginning with Issue 1.

12 MS. KAUFMAN: I think something has just been left  
13 out of the issue for Issue 1.

14 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. What is that?

15 MS. KEATING: I see that.

16 MS. KAUFMAN: The first part of the question. I  
17 think it should say has BellSouth met the requirements of  
18 section and then continue on.

19 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, that would be helpful.

20 MS. WHITE: I kind of like 271(c)(1)(A).

21 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, I didn't know what my answer was.

22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We will make that change.

23 MS. KEATING: Sorry about that.

24 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Issue 2. I'm looking now on  
25 Page 20 of the draft prehearing order, and this would be under



1 the ALEC's position. D and E, the subparts there, no position,  
2 and then we have -- this is just the first time that I see this  
3 in this draft prehearing order. As we go through the other  
4 issues likewise there are no position taken on some of the  
5 issues. I guess I just need clarification from the parties or  
6 from Ms. Keating as to what status is given when no position is  
7 taken, and it says no position at this time. And is there a  
8 difference between no position at this time and no position  
9 period.

10 MS. KEATING: I would say there is a difference  
11 between no position at this time and no position. If somebody  
12 were to take no position and not to designate anything on that  
13 in their prehearing statement, pursuant to the order  
14 establishing procedure I would interpret that as having waived  
15 their ability to make any argument on that subissue.

16 But when parties designate no position at this time,  
17 I think that that is a little different and should leave it  
18 open for them to make argument on that subissue. Granted, I  
19 don't think it's the best and preferred thing to put in a  
20 prehearing statement, but --

21 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, what obligation are  
22 parties under to take a position?

23 MS. KEATING: Well --

24 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I mean, conceivably someone  
25 could come in and say no position at this time and preserve on

1 every single issue. And I'm not so sure if that is conducive  
2 to what this whole process is about and the purpose of this  
3 prehearing conference.

4 MS. KEATING: Well, it is certainly within your  
5 ability to direct the parties today to either present a  
6 position on those subissues or to indicate that they have  
7 waived their opportunity to argue on those subissues.

8 MS. KAUFMAN: Might I be heard on that?

9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Surely.

10 MS. KAUFMAN: I guess we are the first party on this  
11 issue that has taken no position at that time. What our intent  
12 was was to have the ability to brief that issue at the  
13 conclusion of the hearing. The burden in this case is on  
14 BellSouth to ensure that it has met each one of these items.  
15 And we were intending to make a distinction, I think, between  
16 some parties that said no position, which I would take to mean  
17 that they are not going to take a position on the issue at all,  
18 and no position at this time, which I believe leaves us the  
19 ability to brief the issue at the conclusion of the case based  
20 on any evidence that might arise. And we would ask that we be  
21 permitted to do that.

22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: So it is your intent to just  
23 maintain your ability to brief an issue, but you are not going  
24 to be actively litigating the issue at the hearing. But  
25 depending upon the outcome of the hearing or what evidence is

1 produced, you preserve your right to brief it? Am I  
2 characterizing that correctly or not?

3 MS. KAUFMAN: Well, somewhat. I don't think we are  
4 waiving our right to cross on a particular issue, and that  
5 would be included in any evidence that might be elicited during  
6 the hearing that we would include in our briefs. Now, it could  
7 turn out on some of these issues that when we actually come to  
8 the post-hearing phase and write our brief we would say no  
9 position. But I think we are entitled to maintain that  
10 flexibility until we hear what the evidence of record is.

11 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Are parties in agreement  
12 with that understanding? I just want to make sure the ground  
13 rules are clear for everyone.

14 MS. WHITE: I just would ask for a clarification. As  
15 Ms. Keating said, some people say no position at this time and  
16 some companies say no position.

17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We have a good example on the  
18 same page, on Page 20.

19 MS. WHITE: Right. And I have no problem with what  
20 Ms. Kaufman has discussed, but like for ACCESS when they say no  
21 position, is that they are not just going to take a -- they are  
22 not taking a position on that issue in this case?

23 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: That is correct.

24 MS. WHITE: Okay. Other than that, I don't have any.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Just so everyone is clear.

1 Very good. Okay. And under WorldCom on Page 21 for Subparts D  
2 and E, when it indicates that it adopts the ALECs' position,  
3 that is no position at this time, and so that is what that  
4 means, no position at this time, correct?

5 Ms. McNULTY: That is correct.

6 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We just have to sort through  
7 this and decipher it.

8 MS. WHITE: It's code.

9 Ms. McNULTY: You cracked the code.

10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Moving right along.

11 Issue 3. Issue 4. I have a question for Sprint, Ms.  
12 Masterton. You seem to be very consistent and I applaud you  
13 for that, that BellSouth has not met its burden. And I guess  
14 my question is there are a number of issues particularly --  
15 well, the checklist issues, which BellSouth met those at the  
16 last 271 proceeding. Is it your position that regardless of  
17 whether there was a positive or a determination for those  
18 particular checklist items, it is still BellSouth's burden to  
19 prove those in this proceeding?

20 MS. MASTERTON: Yes, to the extent that there is any  
21 new information or anything that has changed since that last  
22 hearing in -- you know, the order came out -- yes, we believe  
23 that BellSouth has the burden to demonstrate that they continue  
24 to be in compliance with that checklist item.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Ms. White, that is your

1 understanding, as well?

2 MS. WHITE: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: All right. Issue 5. Issue 6.  
4 Issue 7. Issue 8.

5 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioners, we do have a change on  
6 Issue 8 for the ALECs' position where it has A, B, and C. The  
7 A, our position is no. And then if you look in subletter B  
8 there, the text that follows the word no just needs to be moved  
9 up to A. And then our position on B is no, and our position on  
10 C is no.

11 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Any other changes?  
12 Issue 9. Ms. Kaufman, let me ask you about your position on  
13 Issue 9, and there are some that follow. You use the  
14 terminology cast doubt. I guess you're not sure whether they  
15 meet it or not but you just doubt it, is that your position?

16 MS. KAUFMAN: Well, I think our position is they  
17 haven't met their burden. And I can change the wording of that  
18 if that is not clear. I think these issues -- which I feel  
19 compelled in the light of Ms. Merritt's confession -- are these  
20 data integrity issues, as we have characterized them, are some  
21 of the testimony that is going to be stricken. So that also  
22 might change our position on this issue.

23 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, you know, me, when I was  
24 reading this, and I always read it with the eye of trying to  
25 make it as clear as possible for my fellow Commissioners when

1 they review the prehearing order, if it is your position that  
2 they have not met their burden and the answer is no, perhaps it  
3 should say no, and then describe the reason you think it is no  
4 and the fact that you have issues with the data and the fact  
5 that it is, in your opinion, cast doubt. Would that be a  
6 clearer statement of your position?

7 MS. KAUFMAN: That's fine, and I don't have any  
8 objection to changing our position to no, the lack of integrity  
9 of BellSouth's data concerning its performance as to this issue  
10 demonstrates that it has failed to comply with this checklist  
11 item, if that is a more clear statement of our position.

12 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.

13 MS. KAUFMAN: And that would be the case for -- as  
14 you said there are several where we have taken the same  
15 position.

16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. We will make that  
17 change. And if you could give that to staff in writing so they  
18 can make sure they have it accurately. Very well. Issue 10.  
19 Issue 11. Issue 12. Issue 13. Issue 14. Issue 15.  
20 Issue 16.

21 Ms. Kaufman, your position on Issue 16, should you  
22 just say no position?

23 MS. KAUFMAN: I think we could say no position at  
24 this time.

25 COMMISSIONER DEASON: No position at this time to

1 preserve your right?

2 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Let's make that change.  
4 Issue 17. And, Ms. Kaufman, why is your position not  
5 applicable, because you think that the purpose of the question  
6 just doesn't apply? The issue states if the answers to Issues  
7 2 through 15 are yes, and then it goes on to say -- I assume  
8 that it is your position that Issues 2 through 15 have not been  
9 met, and that's the reason you say not applicable?

10 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Are you referring to ACCESS,  
11 Commissioner?

12 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. Mr.  
13 McGlothlin, yes.

14 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: You are correct, sir. The intent is  
15 to say that because the premise of the question is in error,  
16 then it is not applicable.

17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can we clarify that?

18 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Certainly.

19 COMMISSIONER DEASON: If you could provide some  
20 language to staff that clarifies that.

21 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: All right.

22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Issue 18. Very well. We  
23 survived that. We will now proceed to Section IX, the exhibit  
24 list. As we indicated with the list of witnesses there are a  
25 number of exhibits, which depending upon the outcome of the

1 reconsideration, may or may not be stricken. Those I believe  
2 have been designated by staff. If there are any changes or  
3 corrections that need to be made, we will hear those at this  
4 time. Staff, apparently you did a good job. I'm not hearing  
5 anything. Okay.

6 That takes us to Section X, proposed stipulations.  
7 No one has a proposed stipulation at this time, I take it?

8 MR. LAMOUREUX: I was just going to take a step back  
9 in the era of new honesty. Again, there are some of our  
10 witnesses whose testimony was stricken, but the exhibits aren't  
11 indicated that they have been stricken, as well. The example I  
12 can see is Ms. Wheeler again. Again, since the text of all her  
13 testimony was stricken, I am presuming that would include the  
14 exhibits as well that go along with that text. As the Jiminy  
15 Cricket in my ear is whispering, that also would include Ms.  
16 Seigler.

17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We appreciate that.

18 MR. LAMOUREUX: I have not gone through and done a  
19 comprehensive matching up to see which exhibits would go with  
20 which stricken testimony. I think my volunteer of honesty only  
21 goes so far.

22 MS. WHITE: Well, I will admit the same thing. I  
23 don't believe we have, either. We thought we would do that as  
24 part of the October 3rd refiling, you know, and let -- because  
25 you would file the revised exhibits or the testimony all over



1 again, so you would have the exhibits that you need and not the  
2 ones that have been stricken.

3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you for that. And, yes,  
4 I think assuming the order stands, well, then -- and the  
5 testimony is refiled, then certainly you can make sure that  
6 everything is consistent with the intent of the order anyway.  
7 Does staff have a problem with that?

8 MS. KEATING: So just to be clear, we should not add  
9 those in?

10 COMMISSIONER DEASON: No, no. I think to the extent  
11 we know now that there are exhibits which have been stricken or  
12 consistent with the intent of the order should be stricken, we  
13 should go ahead and designate those if we are aware of them.

14 MS. KEATING: So Witness Seigler, Witness Wheeler --

15 MS. KAUFMAN: It would include Witness Davis and  
16 Campbell, also.

17 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Beth, I don't believe Mr. Page is  
18 listed at all on the exhibit list. Scanning I don't find his  
19 name.

20 MS. KEATING: Pate?

21 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Page.

22 MS. KEATING: And that one would also be designated  
23 on there but stricken.

24 MR. McGLOTHLIN: To be consistent with the ruling,  
25 yes.

1 MR. LAMOUREUX: If I could ask a logistical question.  
2 If the reconsideration motion is not granted, if, and we file  
3 testimony, and if there are exhibits that have been left out,  
4 but there are other exhibits to the testimony that stay in,  
5 would you want us to keep the original numbers for the exhibits  
6 as we originally filed them or would you want us to renumber  
7 the exhibits?

8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I think it would be clearer to  
9 keep the original numbers. That is my personal preference.  
10 Now, if I hear an objection, I am certainly willing to  
11 entertain that. I think it would be clearer if we keep the  
12 original numbering system.

13 MR. LAMOUREUX: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Since there is no stipulation  
15 to this docket, we can proceed to Section XI, pending motions.  
16 I think we have already addressed this. Section XII,  
17 confidentiality matters that are pending. I think we have  
18 already addressed this.

19 MS. KEATING: And if I could just note that that  
20 first motion has been addressed.

21 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, that order has been  
22 signed. And Section XIII, rulings.

23 MS. WHITE: Yes, our last issue is on that. It says  
24 ten minutes per party. And since there is one of us and 40  
25 million of them, you could spend the whole four days of the

1 hearing doing their opening statements. So I guess what I  
2 would like to see is kind of like what happened at the last  
3 hearing, which was there was an aggregate amount of time for  
4 each side. In other words, we had X amount of time, and all of  
5 these people had X amount of time that they could divide up  
6 among them. I don't remember how much time that was. I think  
7 it was -- was it 30 minutes? Okay. I don't think we need 30  
8 minutes.

9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. It has been suggested  
10 that it not be ten minutes per party, but be a certain amount  
11 of time per side. Any response to that suggestion?

12 MS. McNULTY: Yes, Commissioner Deason. How about  
13 something like this, we don't know whether or not all the ALECs  
14 side will wish to participate as just one opening statement.  
15 What about five minutes per party, and let BellSouth have as  
16 much time as it needs?

17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: No, we don't want to do that.

18 MS. WHITE: Now wait a minute.

19 COMMISSIONER DEASON: You just said that 30 minutes  
20 was more than enough.

21 MS. WHITE: I'm just teasing. Well, how many parties  
22 are there?

23 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, Ms. Kaufman has about a  
24 half dozen herself.

25 MS. WHITE: I know.

1 MS. KAUFMAN: But all their testimony is stricken.

2 MS. WHITE: Five minutes for each nonlawyer, because  
3 there are 43 lawyers so that will take forever.

4 MS. KEATING: 17.

5 MS. WHITE: I mean, five minutes times 16 is -- how  
6 long is that, an hour and a half.

7 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let's just do this, perhaps it  
8 is simpler. Ms. White, even though you do not need 30 minutes,  
9 we will just do it 30 minutes per side, and that should be  
10 sufficient time for the parties in opposition to allocate that  
11 between themselves. And if it is one person taking 30 minutes,  
12 or if it is ten taking three each, I mean, I will leave that up  
13 to the parties to work that out between themselves.

14 Now, unless I hear a strenuous objection that that is  
15 not sufficient. Please voice it now. Your silence is taken  
16 that that is acceptable. Thirty minutes per side. And, Ms.  
17 White, you have already indicated you don't need 30, so don't  
18 feel obligated.

19 MS. WHITE: It will not take 30. I can't promise it  
20 won't 29 and 30 seconds, but --

21 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That concludes the review of  
22 the draft prehearing order section-by-section. I will open it  
23 up to parties to address anything further at this time.

24 Mr. Feil.

25 MR. FEIL: I have one quick matter, Commissioner. I

1 just wanted to request and ask assurance from the parties and  
2 from the Commission that to the extent necessary to accommodate  
3 the travel schedule of the various witnesses. I don't want to  
4 disrupt the orderly pursuit of the hearing and the Commission's  
5 calendar and so forth, and I know that there is a schedule for  
6 the witnesses and the order of witnesses, I just wanted to make  
7 sure that to the extent necessary the parties will agree to  
8 accommodate the travel schedules of their witnesses so if we  
9 have to shift a few people around from one day to another that  
10 that will be acceptable.

11 MS. WHITE: I don't have a problem with that. The  
12 only witness I know that we have to get on the first or second  
13 day is Ms. Caldwell. She is the only one of my witnesses that  
14 has -- but since she was number two, I didn't bring it up  
15 because I figured surely she would get up in the first or  
16 second day. But other than that, we would be happy. We know  
17 people are coming from all over the country, and with the  
18 situation you just never know until you get to the airport what  
19 is happening.

20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I think historically we have  
21 been very accommodating. Parties have been very understanding  
22 and I have no reason to believe that that would not take place  
23 here, as well. Not only that, but the Commission has tried to  
24 be very accommodating. If necessary we have started early or  
25 worked late in the evening to make sure that certain witnesses

1 are accommodated so that they can meet their flight schedules  
2 and any other contingencies which may arise as we go through  
3 the hearing process.

4 MR. FEIL: Thank you.

5 MS. KAUFMAN: Since we are talking about scheduling,  
6 Mr. Feil brought up, as I looked at the witnesses, and also  
7 since we have that split and we have Thursday and Friday and  
8 then the hearing doesn't resume until Wednesday, it seemed to  
9 me that probably the ALEC witnesses would not be getting on the  
10 stand at least until the second week, because especially now  
11 that we have agreed that we are going to combine direct and  
12 rebuttal, and Bell has a lot of witnesses, I'm sure most folks,  
13 like me, have not prepared cross examination yet.

14 But at least I was thinking that my witnesses, to the  
15 extent there are any left, would probably not have to appear  
16 until Wednesday, because they are all coming from -- actually  
17 from out of state, not just out of town.

18 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff.

19 MS. KEATING: Well, I guess Ms. Kaufman's guess is as  
20 good as mine. She is probably better at estimating how long  
21 she and the other ALECs intend to cross-examine the BellSouth  
22 witnesses, so --

23 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, just let me --

24 MS. WHITE: You're betting on whether they will cross  
25 eleven witnesses in two days I guess is what it comes down to.

1           COMMISSIONER DEASON: And I guess you have some  
2 control over that, just write more questions. I can't at this  
3 point guarantee that we are going to be concluded with a  
4 certain phase of the hearing at a certain time and give you,  
5 you know, a time certain to produce your witnesses. You are  
6 just going to have to use your best judgment and it will be up  
7 to Chairman Jacobs, I guess, to make accommodations if and when  
8 it's necessary.

9           MS. KAUFMAN: I understand.

10          COMMISSIONER DEASON: I can share this with you,  
11 there has already been the observation that perhaps this  
12 hearing will not take the entire five days. And there have  
13 already been numerous inquiries as to who can have what days  
14 that are left over. So there is going to be some desire to  
15 conclude the hearing, if it can, to not take the entire five  
16 days. If we can conclude the hearing and it frees up a day,  
17 there are plenty of uses that day can be put to already on the  
18 priority list.

19           Okay. Anything further at this point? Hearing none,  
20 thank you all for your participation, and this prehearing  
21 conference is adjourned.

22           (The hearing concluded at 10:30 a.m.)  
23  
24  
25


1 STATE OF FLORIDA     )  
2                             :     CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER  
3 COUNTY OF LEON     )

4  
5             I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Office of Hearing Reporter  
6 Services, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk and Administrative  
7 Services, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was  
8 heard at the time and place herein stated.

9             IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically  
10 reported the said proceedings; that the same has been  
11 transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this  
12 transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said  
13 proceedings.

14             I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,  
15 attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative  
16 or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel  
17 connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in  
18 the action.

19             DATED THIS 24th day of September, 2001.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JANE FAUROT, RPR  
Chief, Office of Hearing Reporter Services  
FPSC Division of Commission Clerk and  
Administrative Services  
(850) 413-6732