

CCA Official Filing

8/13/02*****8:58 AM*****Ruth Nettles*****1

Ruth Nettles

From: Hong Wang
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2002 8:58 AM
To: Ruth Nettles
Subject: FW: 020880

Importance: High

-----Original Message-----

From: kimberly.caswell@verizon.com [mailto:kimberly.caswell@verizon.com]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2002 8:57 PM
To: bkeating@psc.state.fl.us; hwang@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: pkwiggins@katzlaw.com
Subject: 020880
Importance: High

I was mistaken about the redacted title on the pleading in the above-referenced docket. I know it's a little unusual, but it is confidential, after all. I've asked Patrick to explain why tomorrow (he knows better than I do and I'm on vacation). IN the meantime, we would appreciate it if you pulled down the confidential version of the case caption on the website and replaced it with the redacted one, as filed and as you had it up this morning. Thanks very much. Sorry for the inconvenience.

- AUS _____
- CAF _____
- CMP _____
- COM _____
- CTR _____
- ECR _____
- GCL _____
- OPC _____
- MMS _____
- SEC
- OTH _____

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08484 AUG 13 2002

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

CCA Official Filing

8/12/02*****1:43 PM*****Ruth Nettles*****1

CONFIDENTIAL

Ruth Nettles

From: Beth Keating
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2002 1:41 PM
To: Hong Wang; Ruth Nettles
Subject: FW: 020880

REDACTED

Based on this e-mail, I believe that you may go ahead and include the necessary information in the docket title. I will request the necessary revised pleading when contacted by Verizon's counsel.

-----Original Message-----

From: kimberly.caswell@verizon.com [mailto:kimberly.caswell@verizon.com]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2002 11:18 AM
To: Beth Keating
Cc: Hong Wang
Subject: RE: 020880

I think we've figured it out. It was the [REDACTED] pleading. The problem is that outside counsel filed it. I told them to be sure they complied with confidentiality procedures and it appears they went overboard. I have asked them to call you. The title should not have been redacted. If it looks like there are other things that should not have been redacted, let them know and we'll redo it. Sorry.

Beth Keating
<BKeating@PSC.STA
Caswell/EMPL/FL/Verizon@VZNotes, Hong
TE.FL.US>
08/12/02 11:03 AM
To: Kimberly A.
Wang <HWang@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
cc:
Subject: RE: 020880

Can't say that I do know what it's about, since apparently the large majority of it was redacted and, therefore hasn't made its way up here. Perhaps Hong can help? You can call her at (850) 413-6762. She's got the pleadings.

-----Original Message-----

From: kimberly.caswell@verizon.com [mailto:kimberly.caswell@verizon.com]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2002 10:08 AM
To: Beth Keating
Cc: Hong Wang
Subject: Re: 020880

So I get this to the right person, do you know what the complaint is about? I don't remember filing anything. Thanks.

CA Official Filing

8 /12/02***1:43 PM*****Ruth Nettles*****2**

Beth Keating

<BKeating@PSC.STA
Caswell/EMPL/FL/Verizon@VZNotes
TE.FL.US>
<HWang@PSC.STATE.FL.US>

To: Kimberly A.
cc: Hong Wang
Subject: 020880

08/12/02 09:48 AM

Hi. When you get a chance, could you please give me a call about a complaint just filed by Verizon? We have a question about the title---in particular, did you really intend to redact part of the title? If so, on what basis?