1 2	FLORIDA :	BEFORE TH PUBLIC SERVIC			
3				•	
4	In the Matter of		: DOCKET NO :	. 980119-TP	
5	Complaint of Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems, Inc. against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1966; Petition for resolution of disputes as to implementation and interpretation of interconnection, resale and collocation agreements; and petition for		: :		
6					
7					
8					
10			4	100 miles	
	emergency relief.		:	C. C. C. C.	5
11	CONT PART THE CONT CONT CONT CONT CONT CONT CONT CONT		-		
12					
13	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING C	ONFERENCE		
14	DEEODE -	CONSTRUCTOVER E LEON TACORG TR			
15	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER E. LEON JACOBS, JR. Prehearing Officer			
16					
17	DATE:	Friday, Apri	1 17, 1998		
18	TIME:	Commenced at 9:35 a.m. Concluded at 10:04 a.m.			
19	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 152			
20	4075 Esplar		-		
21		Tallahassee,	riorida		
22	REPORTED BY:	JOY KELLY, C	SR, RPR		S SE
23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		of Reporting		BER-DV
24					
25					DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
I	l FLO	RIDA PUBLIC S	ERVICE COMMI	SSION	1000

APPEARANCES:

SUZANNE FANNON SUMMERLIN, 1311-b Paul
Russell Road, #201, Tallahassee, Florida 32301,
appearing on behalf of Supra Telecommunications &
Information Systems, Inc.

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

BETH KEATING and JOHN BOWMAN, Florida Public Service Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

1 PROCEEDINGS (Hearing convened at 9:35 a.m.) 2 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Good morning. 3 4 Counsel, read the notice, please. 5 MS. KEATING: By notice issued April 10th, 6 1998, this time and place has been set for a prehearing conference in 980119-TP, the complaint of Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. 8 against BellSouth Telecommunications. The purpose is 9 as set forth in the notice. 10 11 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Thank you. Take 12 appearances. 13 MS. WHITE: Nancy White for BellSouth Telecommunications. 15 MS. SUMMERLIN: Suzanne Summerlin for Supra 16 Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. 17 MS. KEATING: Beth Keating and John Bowman 18 appearing for Commission Staff. 19 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. We're here. Okay. Do we have some preliminary matters? How shall 20 21 we proceed? 22 MS. KEATING: Actually, Commissioner, there 23 are a number of outstanding motions in this docket. However, there's only one that Staff feels is

appropriate to be ruled on at this time.

24

Supra's motion for leave to file amended testimony of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Reinke, and a motion to extend date for rebuttal testimony, which was filed April 8th, 1998. That was an agreed upon motion and Staff recommends that that be granted at this time.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Well, I guess in terms -are you talking about the amended testimony not being
agreed; you're not referring to that as an agreed -you're just talking --

MS. KEATING: The agreed motion for leave to file the amended testimony of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Reinke on April 8th.

was an agreed one, and that that should be granted. Is that what you just said?

MS. KEATING: And the motion for extension of rebuttal testimony.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Okay. Fine. I'm sorry, I didn't understand what you said.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Well, let's go ahead and address that motion. Is there anything that the parties would like to add?

MS. SUMMERLIN: If it's being reflected that
it was an agreed upon motion, then --

- 1	
1	MS. WHITE: Yeah. BellSouth has had no
2	problem with Supra filing the amended direct testimony
3	of Mr. Reinke and Mr. Ramos on the 8th of April. We
4	do have another motion concerning parts of that
5	testimony, but just the motion for leave to file, we
6	have no opposition.
7	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. I'll grant that
8	motion then.
9	Okay. As I understand it, there's a motion
10	for reconsideration on the issues.
11	MS. SUMMERLIN: Yes, sir.
12	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. And there's
13	also my understanding that Staff has prepared a
14	recommendation for a decision of that motion of the
15	Commission.
16	MS. KEATING: That is correct, Commissioner.
17	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: In that event, I'm
18	going to defer ruling on that motion and allow it to
19	come on to the regular cycle of this Commission's
20	vote. Okay.
21	MS. WHITE: Just for clarification,
22	Commissioner Jacobs, you're going to defer ruling on
23	BellSouth's motion to strike that testimony or

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

24 portions of that testimony?

25

MS. WHITE: That's fine.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. And next?

There are other motions, and Staff has indicated that probably those other motions are not ripe for decision at this time.

Just so we're clear, as I understand it,

BellSouth's Motion to Strike Amended Direct Testimony,

Supra's Motion for Leave to File Amended Testimony -
let me see -- and the second, BellSouth's motion

regarding the testimony of Mr. Bradford as well.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Brad Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: No, the first one was for Ms. Hamilton, I think, right? There's one April 3rd motion; that's regarding Mr. Hamilton?

MS. WHITE: No. That's regarding Mr. Ramos that you said you will defer to after the full Commission rules on the Motion for Reconsideration.

MR. BOWMAN: Commissioner, it's Bradford Hamilton. That's the same person.

motions, I'm going to go with Staff's recommendation.

As I understand it, much hinges upon what happens with the vote of the Commission on the motion that will go before them, and these motions should have some clarity added after that, and we can deal with those

after the motion.

My desire is that we not have any additional argument on those, just go and rule on -- if there's any difference with that, you can let counsel know.

Are there any other preliminary matters?

MS. KEATING: Commissioner, it's my understanding that Ms. Summerlin may want to make a request at this time.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Yes. Commissioner, we can do it now or after we go through the Prehearing Order, but Supra wants to make a motion this morning, orally, to continue the hearing to May 21st and 22nd. Also, in doing that, to extend the discovery date.

regarding the amended testimony of Mr. Hamilton. And in their motion they ask that that amended testimony be stricken, or that the hearing be continued. We may or may not want to get into discussing that motion right now. But part of the basis for me making the motion for continuance is that it is appropriate, I think, for BellSouth to have time to respond to Mr. Hamilton's amended testimony.

I would make, just as a sideline the point that Mr. Hamilton's amended testimony could have been

filed as rebuttal testimony on a much later date, at which time BellSouth would have had no opportunity to rebut it. But I think that it is appropriate to continue the hearing to May 21st and 22nd. I understand from Staff that those dates are available at this point.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Another very important reason is that Supra needs to depose a number of BellSouth employees. BellSouth has indicated that they'll be perfectly willing to make their witnesses, the five individuals that have provided prefiled testimony in this case, for deposition and that's very good. The problem is we've got a number of people who have not prefiled testimony in this proceeding that are witnesses that we need to depose because they have information relevant to this proceeding. They are people that Supra employees interacted with and Supra customers interacted with during the months leading up to this And Supra has a right to depose those people. case. Because BellSouth has stated to us they are not going to make these people available, produce them voluntarily, and we're going to have to get personal service on each of these employees, that will extend the amount of time it will take for us to get these depositions set up. And, you know, in order to be

able to do what we need to do, we're going to have to have a little more time to do that. And that's -- those are the major reasons.

I also think it's important to note that we may need a two-day period for this hearing as opposed to the one day, April 30th, that we have currently set. I think a two-day period would be much more reasonable based on what we're looking at, at this point in time.

We also have outstanding discovery that we have sent to BellSouth. They've responded with objections to a number of those interrogatories and request for production of documents. We will be filing a Motion to Compel momentarily. It has not been filed yet. But discovery is actually due Monday, the 20th. So until Monday we won't know what else they may or may not be willing to produce. And we need to have the opportunity -- at least have the opportunity to pursue that discovery and make our arguments that we have a right to it.

I just have to reiterate that it's critical for Supra to have the opportunity to depose witnesses that have relevant information. And we have today provided a letter to Ms. White asking for the full names and business addresses of the other individuals

that we haven't already been given that information on, so that we can proceed with what we need to do to get those people deposed. Those are the basic reasons.

And I think that there's one problem that

I'm aware of that Ms. White can present herself, I

guess, but one of the witnesses they have might not be
available on May 21st or 22nd.

Supra is willing to try to work with BellSouth and Staff to try to deal with that problem. Perhaps we can depose that individual and stipulate that individual's testimony into the record. Whatever needs to be done to address that problem, Supra is willing to do that. So that's basically our motion.

the motion would be to continue the hearing until the 21st and extend it into a two-day hearing for the 22nd as well?

MS. SUMMERLIN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Ms. White?

MS. WHITE: Well, I have a number of concerns. The first is that the Commission rules state that a continuance is only to be granted for good cause. BellSouth is prepared to go forward on the 30th with the hearing in this matter. I don't

believe that the reasons that Ms. Summerlin has stated are sufficient to warrant a continuance. She says there's outstanding written discovery that's due. Well, there's been a discovery period of over two months. Procedure order was issued on February 24th, 1999, with a discovery cutoff date of, I believe, April 23rd or 24th, 1998, so there's been sufficient time for discovery.

With regard to the employees of BellSouth that she wants to depose, those are considered nonparty witnesses under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. BellSouth is not required to produce those. If Ms. Summerlin wants to issue personal service of a subpoena on these people, then they will have to appear for a deposition.

In addition, what she's handed me today is she wants us to provide Supra with the addresses for these people. Well, that's discovery. And it's not issued as a form of discovery. It's issued in a letter. She should have put it in the form of an interrogatory or production of document request. And if that's done, it's not going to be able to be answered before the discovery cutoff.

So all in all we feel like there hasn't been good cause shown and the matter should go forward on

the 30th. We agree it probably is going to take more than one day, but I think that we just have to find that day where we could.

Now, if the next available date is the 21st and 22nd of May, the problem with that, as

Ms. Summerlin has iterated, is that one of our witnesses is not available on those days, on either one of those two days. So that's a concern I have and something would have to be worked out for that.

So I guess the bottom line is we're prepared to go forward on the 30th, and we don't see any valid reason why it should be continued.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I hear there is agreement, though, that we're probably going beyond one day.

MS. WHITE: There are eight witnesses in the case: Three from Supra and five from BellSouth. So I don't know -- I guess it's possible it could be done in a day but probably not likely.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Staff?

MS. KEATING: I guess I should point out first that although May 21 and 22 do appear to be clear on the calendar, they would have to be cleared with the Chairman's office first before this hearing could be moved. I have checked May 1st, which is --

this hearing is set for April 30th. May 1st is open, so there may be a possibility if this hearing runs long on the 30th of extending it on to May 1st, if that's approved, again, by the Chairman's office. So there is a possibility that if this hearing is retained on the 30th, and does go long, that May 1st would be available.

commissioner JACOBS: Something strikes a bell with me for May 1st. I think there's SEARUC summit on the 1st. May want to check on that.

What I'd like to do -- first of all, a couple of questions. How much of the discovery that is in dispute pertains to issues that are involved in the reconsideration -- are amongst those issues that are in the reconsideration?

MS. SUMMERLIN: Some of the discovery that is in dispute --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Is it a small part or a large part?

MS. SUMMERLIN: I can't tell you right off if it's half and half, but there's a substantial amount that is not necessarily related to those issues. And we don't know yet what is actually going to be produced on Monday, so we don't know.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

MS. KEATING: Staff discussed a possible alternative method of remedying some of Ms. Summerlin's concerns with counsel before we started the prehearing.

We had suggested that it may be possible to extend the time for Ms. White to file rebuttal testimony to Mr. Hamilton; allow Ms. Summerlin to retain Mr. Hamilton's amended direct testimony in this case. And might be a possible option to just extend the discovery deadline a little bit and still keep that April 30th date. That's just a possibility we had discussed earlier.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. How does that address your concerns?

ms. summerLin: That would be perfectly fine, except for the fact we're now going to have to get personal service on potentially 14 employees of the company.

Ms. White's statement that BellSouth does not have to produce these people because they are nonparty individuals. It is quite common in Circuit Court cases for corporations to produce witnesses that are their employees that have information that is relevant to a proceeding. And if BellSouth decides to take the approach that it's necessary to get personal

service on all of these individuals, and that Supra needs to wait for -- I don't know how long Ms. White is saying that we will need to wait to just simply get addresses on individuals -- that I would think would take two hours, at the most, of BellSouth's -- or less of BellSouth's time to provide for us.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Can't personal service be at the employment address?

MS. SUMMERLIN: That's exactly what we're going to try to do. What we're asking is simply the business address of these 14 individuals. We're going to have to get that personal service on all of these individuals. They are located in a lot of different locations. Some of these people are in -- I believe some of them are in Miami, some may be in Birmingham, some may be in Atlanta. I'm not sure right off the top of my head where every one of them is located, but they are in various locations. So that's going to add several day's worth of time. Whereas, if BellSouth chose to try to cooperate and produce them on a certain date, you know, and work with us, we could probably do this a lot quicker.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Here's what I'd like to do. I'd like for you guys to attempt to work through that solution, the proposed solution,

basically of extending discovery and resolving the issues of filing rebuttal.

I'm not going to rule on the Motion to

Continue right now. I'd like to wait until the

Commission votes to see what happens with that vote

and resolution of the respective issues. Because in

my mind that could have an impact on this issue. And

then if I hear -- if I can hear how things are

progressing with that, we'll make a determination as

soon as possible after that, after that vote, within a

day, to give you a ruling on that. Will that be

adequate enough notice for you?

MS. SUMMERLIN: You're talking the day before the hearing, I think, because the 28th is that agenda; is that right? So we're talking about having to assume that the hearing is taking place --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We'll assume that the hearing is taking place. We'll have a ruling that afternoon.

ms. summerLin: Well, Commissioner, respectfully, it won't do any good for Supra to know the day before. I mean, the purpose of trying to get the continuance is to be able to plan to have a couple of weeks more time. But if that's not going to be available --

commissioner Jacobs: Again, what I'm suggesting is work through the proposals that have been given today of extending discovery and extending the time for filing of rebuttal. And let's assume that the 30th will be the date. Again, it is possible that we could have a continuance. I'm deferring ruling on that motion. I'm not ruling on it today.

MR. BOWMAN: Could Staff just interject?

Basically, I hate to sound partisan, but acting as arbitrator, we just wanted to remind the Prehearing Officer that Supra filed this matter on January 23rd, and at that date requested expedited process. And basically we've gone out of our way to assure that that's taken place.

So we just wanted to make sure that the Commissioner was mindful of the date that it was filed. And there has been at least some four months in which some of these matters -- to be settled.

commissioner Jacobs: I want to allow you as best -- each party all possible opportunities to bring the best case that they can bring to this hearing. At this moment I think we can proceed under these circumstances and I think give you a reasonable opportunity to do that.

Another concern I have is the longer we push

this hearing back, the more involved it gets. And that simply means then that the parties are becoming more interactive as opposed to resolving issues. So the hearing is the best place to get that resolved. Discovery won't do that.

But having said that, I'll defer ruling on the Motion to Continue at this moment. We'll have a ruling the afternoon of the 28th, so you'll know by the end of the business day on the 28th whether or not you will have a hearing on the 30th, and hopefully that will be a sufficient amount time to notify your witnesses. But as of this point I would assume that we'll be having the hearing on the 30th.

Any other matters?

MS. KEATING: Now would be appropriate to proceed to the Prehearing Order.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

MS. WHITE: If this will make it shorter, I've looked at our sections of the draft Prehearing Order and I don't have any changes.

MS. SUMMERLIN: I've looked at it and I have a few changes. One is that I would note that there's no reference to the fact that there are issues that have not been decided on yet. I assume they have been left out because of the current status. But if a

motion for reconsideration were granted, then it would have to be redone to show that those issues are in 2 3 there. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's correct. 4 MS. SUMMERLIN: There are a couple of typo 5 things I'll be glad to show the Staff. And there's 6 7 one significant thing that I do want to point out. 8 On the order of witnesses, Supra would very 9 much want to have Mr. Ramos as our first witness. Right now the order of witnesses shows Mr. Reinke as the first witness. I guess the idea was to combine 11 12 the direct and rebuttal. Whatever we need to do, we want Mr. Ramos as our first witness, you know, and we 13 14 can either just do his direct and do the rebuttal later, or whatever you want to do, but --15 16 MS. KEATING: That's fine. 17 MS. WHITE: That brings us to a question, BellSouth doesn't have any problems combining direct 18 and rebuttal. 19 I don't know about Supra. 20 MS. SUMMERLIN: I don't have a problem with it. 21 22 MS. WHITE: Then the order of your witnesses 23 would be Ramos first, Mr. Reinke second, Mr. Hamilton

MS. SUMMERLIN:

third?

24

25

Uh-huh.

MS. WHITE: And --

MS. SUMMERLIN: Actually, I'm sorry. Let me just exercise the right to change my mind. I do want to do Mr. Ramos's rebuttal last. In terms of the order of the witnesses, I would like to have Mr. Ramos on his direct testimony, then Mr. Reinke, Mr. Hamilton and at the end do Mr. Ramos's rebuttal, because he's the only one that filed rebuttal.

MS. WHITE: Well, then we're not going to combine direct and rebuttal, I guess. So it would be Mr. Finlen first on his direct, Mr. Milner second on his direct, then -- Mr. Finlen and Mr. Milner can do their rebuttal and direct at the same time. Then I assume Mr. Ramos will do his rebuttal and then Mr. Scollard, Mr. Cathey and Mr. Stacy will do their rebuttal.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Sounds workable.

MS. SUMMERLIN: I have a couple of typos, and I think that's really all I've got left to point out. I'll give that to the Staff.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Let me just reiterate the order of witnesses. First will be Mr. Ramos on direct, second will be Mr. Reinke on direct, third will be Mr. Hamilton on direct, fourth will be

Mr. Finlen on direct --

MS. WHITE: Direct and rebuttal.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Direct and rebuttal. Fifth will be Mr. Milner on direct and rebuttal as well?

MS. WHITE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Sixth will be
Mr. Ramos on rebuttal. Seventh would be Mr. Scollard
on rebuttal, eighth will be Mr. Cathey on rebuttal -is that ninth or did I miscount?

MS. WHITE: No --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay, you're right.

And ninth will be Mr. Stacy on rebuttal. Okay. And you had some additional revisions, Ms. Summerlin?

MS. SUMMERLIN: No, I don't. I have a couple of typos I'll point out to the Staff.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Any other matters we should consider at this time?

MS. KEATING: I want to point out real quickly Ms. Summerlin had mentioned there were some issues that still may be outstanding due to the Motion for Reconsideration. There may be some undecided issues. I would just point out, in the pending motion section we did indicate that there is a Motion for Reconsideration.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Yes, I noted that. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, it occurs to me we may want to identify some procedures here. I don't like to prejudge at all, but if the Motion for Reconsideration is granted, obviously there's procedural issues that are raised. Is it proper to come back after that and deal with it, or can we kind of lay out some tentative procedures here? MS. KEATING: I think you may want to wait until after Tuesday. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Very well. If there are no other matters, this hearing is adjourned. (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 10:04 a.m.)

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 2 3 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing 5 Conference in Docket No. 980119-TP was heard by the Prehearing Officer at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been 8 transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 22 pages, constitutes a true 9 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. DATED this 17th day of April, 1998. 10 11 12 13 14 15 Bureau of Reporting 16 (904) 418-6732 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

25