BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	1				
3					
4	In the Mat	ter of :	DOCKET NO.	990691-T	P AAAA
5	Petition of ICG Group, Inc. for				
6	of unresolved is interconnection	sues in :		Sold Free	74
7	with BellSouth Telecommunication	:			
8		as, mc. :		Ethan Al	
9	******	******	*****	******	T. City
10	* ELECTR	ONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT * CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT * FICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING * NOT INCLUDE PREFILED TESTIMONY. *			
11	* THE OF				
12	*				*
13				* *	
14	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING CC	NFERENCE		
15		COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK Prehearing Officer			
16	BEFORE:				
17	DATE				
18	DATE:	Tuesday, Sept		999	
19	TIME:	Commenced at 1:30 p.m. Concluded at 2:45 p.m.			
20	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center			
21		Room 152 4075 Esplanade Way			
22	REPORTED BY:	Tallahassee,			
23		KIMBERLY K. BERENS, CSR, RPR FPSC Commission Reporter			
24					
25					
				DOCUMENT	NUMBER-DATE

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

APPEARANCES:

JOSEPH A. McGLOTHLIN and VICKI GORDON

KAUFMAN, McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson,

Dekker, Kaufman, Arnold and Steen, 117 South Gadsden

Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on

behalf of ICG Telecom Group, Inc.

EARL EDENFIELD and MICHAEL GOGGIN, c/o Nancy Sims, 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

C. LEE FORDHAM, 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			
2	(Hearing convened at 1:30 p.m.)			
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would you read the			
4	Notice, please.			
5	MR. FORDHAM: Commissioner, we're here today			
6	pursuant to notice of prehearing on Docket No. 990691,			
7	Petition by ICG Telecom Group Inc. for arbitration of			
8	unresolved issues in interconnection negotiations with			
9	BellSouth Telecommunications Inc.			
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. Take			
11	appearances.			
12	MR. GOGGIN: Michael Goggin for BellSouth			
13	Telecommunications.			
14	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Joe McGlothlin and Vicki			
15	Kaufman for ICG. Commissioner, I'd like to introduce			
16	Bruce Holdridge who's Vice President of Government			
17	Affairs for ICG.			
18	MR. EDENFIELD: We also have Kip Edenfield			
19	for BellSouth.			
20	MR. FORDHAM: And Lee Fordham with the			
21	Florida Public Service Commission.			
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Edenfield, are you			
23	making an appearance as an attorney?			
24	MR. EDENFIELD: Yes, Your Honor. I am a			
1				

Florida licensed attorney.

1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I thought I noticed you 2 signed something so I was -- I didn't catch Bruce's 3 last name. 4 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Holdridge. 5 H-O-L-D-R-I-D-G-E. COMMISSIONER CLARK: He is just here 6 7 representing the company? He's not --8 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Right. 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Mr. Fordham, what do I do now? What's the next step? 10 11 MR. FORDHAM: Well, Commissioner, we should 12 perhaps just go through the order -- the draft 13 prehearing order in the order that it's outlined and 14 so that we're on track with the proposed procedure. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Let's qo ahead and go through it. Then when we get to the 16 17 first issue that's pursuant -- that is the subject of 18 a motion to strike, I guess --19 MR. FORDHAM: Well, if we're going in the 20 order, I think the first thing perhaps is to see if we're okay on the Order of Witnesses, Part 6, in the 21 22 draft prehearing order. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. And then when we 24 get to the first issue on -- that is subject to a

motion to remove, then we'll take up the motion?

25

+	MR. FORDHAM: That might be a good time to		
2	take up the motions.		
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And then take the		
4	motion to strike testimony at the end?		
5	MR. FORDHAM: I think that would be		
6	appropriate.		
7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. So, Mr. Fordham		
8	you recommend we start on what page? On the Page		
9	4?		
10	MR. FORDHAM: Page 4 of the draft order,		
11	Commissioner, Part 6, Order of Witnesses.		
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Is there any		
13	change we have to make to the order of witnesses?		
14	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We don't propose a change		
15	in the order of witnesses. There is a typo on Page 4		
16	Proffered By. Should be "ICG", and throughout the		
17	Page 4 and Page 5.		
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.		
19	MR. FORDHAM: I'm sorry. Where are you,		
20	Joe?		
21	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Under the column Proffered		
22	By, there is a transposition there. It should be		
23	"ICG".		
24	MR. FORDHAM: I see. Correct. Thank you.		
25	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any changes to the		

basic positions? Hearing none, what about Issue 1? I have not read the testimony, but I had a question, Mr. McGlothlin, on your position. It says, "physical and policy reasons." That is supposed to be physical as opposed to fiscal?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. FORDHAM: I'm sorry. That should be fiscal as in monetary?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: No. No. It's correct the way it is as I understand it.

Issue 2. Any changes?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We have no changes to the positions as stated there. For the Staff's information and for the Commissioner's information, we continue to have ongoing discussions with BellSouth in an attempt to see if there's some basis for resolution of this one.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. GOGGIN: Commissioner, if I could just add, I guess. The remaining disagreement seems to be primarily over pricing, not over whether these elements would be made available as UNEs. So, I guess, you know, we, obviously, will continue to work with ICG on an agreement. But our view is that it

need not be arbitrated as worded because we've already agreed, as ICG recognizes in its position, to offer those elements as UNEs.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: There's a caveat to that.

I agree that one of the issues is pricing and it appears that there may be some basis for resolving the price in question, but the issue is articulated as it is because from ICG's perspective there is an availability aspect of the proposal by BellSouth to offer this. And it has to do with whether we would have to collocate in the central office where the frame -- our relay switch resides. And until that also is on the stack of resolved items, we think we'd have to have this phrased as it is.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Goggin.

MR. GOGGIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Stated again what you want changed.

MR. GOGGIN: I guess we would not change our position. I just wanted to take note of the fact that the issue as worded is, "should the following packet-switching capabilities be made available as UNEs." And as ICG recognizes in its answer, BellSouth has made it clear that we will provide these capabilities as UNEs.

The questions that remain have to do with the pricing of the elements themselves and perhaps the transport that may or may not be required depending on where ICG has collocated its equipment. The pricing issues seem to us to be more appropriately determined in the UNE pricing dockets, and in any event aren't within the issue as worded in the procedural order. That being said, I think --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we leave it as it is at this time; the issue? I mean, what do you want me to change?

MR. GOGGIN: Nothing.

ask BellSouth. You say, "No." Your position is,

"First, neither loops, ports nor transport have been
defined by the FCC as UNEs that BellSouth must

provide." Is that -- are you saying, loops, ports or
transports related to enhanced, extended link or
generically?

MR. GOGGIN: I think what we are intending to say is at that time that the prehearing statement was filed, which is where this position comes from, there was no Rule 319 which identified what UNES ILECs were required to provide.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And why was there no --

MR. GOGGIN: Because the Supreme Court had 1 2 vacated Rule 319. 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Gotcha. Okav. know, it made me think, what have we been doing all 4 5 along. MR. GOGGIN: It shall be added that the FCC 6 7 has announced an order to take the place of 319; has 8 not yet issued the order, so it's not yet clear. 9 MR. FORDHAM: Commissioner, that order 10 should be issued prior to the hearing and it well may 11 be that it will respond to some of the Issue 3 --12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I guess, it strikes me that maybe -- you know, you can do what you 13 14 want to, but it strikes me that, BellSouth, you would say that because it's been overturned by the Supreme 15 16 Court, that provision has been overturned, there are 17 no valid definitions of UNEs until the FCC reissues 18 I guess that's what you're saying. 19 MR. GOGGIN: Yes. And perhaps we should 20 have been more clear in the prehearing statement as 21 to --22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: If there's no 23 objection, I think that would help because I certainly 24 saw that and thought, well, what have we been doing

for the past two years or however long it's been. I

25

think -- you know, maybe just footnote because it's been overturned, but we expect it out briefly.

MR. FORDHAM: Well, if it's going to be an amendment to BellSouth's statement, Commissioner, I would prefer they submitted it; that they gave us their proposed wording rather than --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Could you do that just to clarify?

MR. GOGGIN: We'd be happy to do that and we'll circulate it to the parties.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: As I understand it, they're going to clarify what they meant at the time that they wrote this as opposed to something in light of the order that we expect to come out in a few days.

MR. EDENFIELD: I don't think you're going to get anything in a few days. My understanding, from the most recent conversations I've had with our FCC folks, is that it's going to be two weeks before it's released out within the FCC and then another week before it's released to the public. So you're probably looking at three weeks before we'll be able to see anything.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's fine. If you would just state it that because the Supreme Court has

overturned that portion of their order, it hasn't been finely established what is encompassed within the UNEs.

I guess Issue 4 is our first issue on liquidated damages, and I should tell you that I have read the filings, the motion and the response, and I would be happy to allow you some time to orally argue this, and I guess I will start with you, Mr. McGlothlin.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Commissioner, if I may suggest, this is BellSouth's motion to remove.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You are right.

BellSouth, you go first.

MR. GOGGIN: Okay. I'd like to save a bit of time for rebuttal because I'm not entirely sure what they're going to argue. But in a nutshell our position is that this issue has come up repeatedly in arbitrations and the Commission has repeatedly held that the Act -- that the Telecommunications Act does not require liquidated damages or other damage provisions to be grafted on to these agreements and that this Commission has correctly decided that it lacks the jurisdiction under state law to award damages, and therefore, it has not arbitrated this issue.

1 2

3

4

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We would also note that ICG in other forums and, in fact, here, have stated in testimony that they believe that this issue is not appropriate to be arbitrated between two parties and they've recommended that it be brought up in the context of a generic docket, so we suggest that the issues be withdrawn.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. McGlothlin.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: As a preliminary matter, Commissioner, for clarity, I want to point out that BellSouth in its motion mischaracterized Issues 19, 21, 23 and 25.

As I've stated on the first page of our response, this group of issues can be divided into two There are several which present scenarios under which ICG would propose the Commission require the contract to contain liquidated damages. For each of those scenarios there is a following issue that asks, should BellSouth be required to be -- to continue to be responsible. And BellSouth interpreted that to mean additional penalties, but that's not what was intended.

This is a customer relation-type of issue and it goes to the point that ICG is concerned that if BellSouth fails to meet a performance standard such that ICG's customer is harmed, ICG will be blamed by

the customer unless there is a provision within the contract that requires BellSouth to acknowledge responsibility and that is not a penalty. That is not damages. It's something far different. So only 5, 18, 20, 22 and 24 speak to liquidated damages.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me interrupt you.

So what if we say they're responsible? So what if we put that in the agreement? Isn't it going to boil down to a factual determination and who breached the contract or not?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: There will be a factual determination, but we're not asking the Commission to make any type of adjudication as to who's responsible in a given factual situation. But under a situation where there is -- it's demonstrated --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask it a different way. What does this kind of provision get you? Either they're responsible under the contract or they aren't. What difference does it make if you add a provision that says you're responsible for filling your commitments under the contract?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: The difference is that a new entrant is largely dependent upon the performance of the ILECs, in this case BellSouth, for the ability to provide satisfactory service to the customer. And

to build on a business from scratch requires that the customers be satisfied with what the customer is getting. If there is an event in which the customer receives poor service, the customer is going to typically attribute that to its serving provider, in this case ICG, unless there is the responsibility of the ILEC to acknowledge responsibility where that is appropriate. And so it's from the standpoint of being able to build a satisfactory customer relationship that we think this is essential.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. I'm sorry. Go ahead. Did you have anything further?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: A few more thoughts. First of all, BellSouth relies on the fact that ICG withdrew some issues in the Alabama proceeding. The circumstances there are what they are and if there were reasons why ICG decided to pull some issues there, there is certainly no basis for arguing that we have to here.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Isn't it an admission against interest?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: No. It's recognition that for whatever sufficient reasons that were present under the circumstances in the Alabama case, we took a course of action to modify the issues to be arbitrated

there. Those are not present here and we choose not to withdraw are voluntarily.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask it a different way. In one form you're saying it's not appropriate for a two-party -- it to be arbitrated in a two-party dispute. It's more appropriate for generic. And here you're saying it's appropriate for this two-party arbitration.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: I understand the basis for your question now. We have to take these in turn. There's the Alabama proceeding. There is a North Carolina proceeding. In Alabama, ICG voluntarily withdrew certain issues. In North Carolina we sponsored a witness who said we think the Commission, in that case the North Carolina Commission, should open a generic docket.

We are being consistent with that in testimony in this case. Our witness cites BellSouth's failure to negotiate performance standards. Describes the importance of them, and says that she advocates that the Commission address this subject in a generic proceeding. So we're being consistent there.

The only point is that in a situation, which for reasons that are applicable there but not here, we voluntarily withdrew certain issues. That's no basis

on which this Commission can require us to withdraw them in this case.

And that -- you've anticipated my next point. We are asking that these issues preserve for the limited purpose of enabling our witness to convey to the Commission her view that because of the importance of the issues the Commission should open generic proceedings to consider both performance standards and what has been characterized as liquidated damages provisions.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask you this.

Why can't you just petition us to do that and put the reasons in a petition?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: That would be possible to do, but we think that this is also an appropriate venue because her testimony arises from the frustration that grew out of unsuccessful negotiations that led to the arbitration request.

I think the most important point I want to make, Commissioner, goes to the orders cited by the Commission and by BellSouth for the proposition that this Commission can't award damages. And with respect, I'd like to point out that in this case we're not asking the Commission to determine a breach has occurred or to award damages.

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me interrupt you.				
2	Were we considering those in the other cases?				
3	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: No. No. There was a				
4	proposal that liquidated damages be incorporated and				
5	the Commission gave as its reason for deleting those				
6	issues, its view that they were being the				
7	Commission was being asked to award damages and				
8	that it is that finding that I'm taking issue with.				
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, that may have				
10	been misstated because I recall that what it was, was				
11	that we could not we could not award damages. That				
12	is a judicial function. And since we were without the				
13	authority to award damages and it was outside our				
14	jurisdiction, we could not then arbitrate that issue.				
15	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: It is the second part of				
16	that				
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I believe they were				
18	before us in those two cases or Joe, let me just				
19	tell you. It strikes me that this same argument has				
20	come up before.				
21	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Similar arguments I'm sure,				
22	and the Commission said in the orders cited by				
23	BellSouth, we would be, in effect, awarding damages to				
24	one party for a breach of contract.				

And I want to point out that another agency,

faced with similar arguments, reached a very different conclusion. I've asked the Commission to take official recognition of a case by the New York Public Service Commission, and at Page 6, that the New York agency characterized AT&T's request for a liquidated damage provision this way.

Moreover, AT&T continues in adopting a schedule of liquidated damages for failure to meet service quality standards. We would not in any event, be making a damage award or compensation for a specific adjudicated wrong.

And on the same page the Commission concluded this way. "We agree with AT&T's two central points." And further into the same paragraph --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What are those two central points?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Well, the first, we are acting here pursuant to authority granted by Congress under the Act; that is, the provision for liquidated damages. And that authority permits us to award terms and conditions designed to adequately enforce the provisions of interconnection agreements.

And the second central point is this. Such an award would not be a damage award for it would set forth stipulated remedies for agreed upon contract

breaches and would not adjudicate a specific wrong.

And I ask you to consider that view of the liquidated damages provision. And ICG regards this not as a determination of damages, but as a preventive measure.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask you a question. If we adopted that view in this proceeding, would it overrule our decisions in at least one, and I think more than one, prior arbitration proceedings?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Yes. This would be a very different conclusion than the one you reached in the AT&T, MCI order that was cited by BellSouth.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: But for good reason.

MR. GOGGIN: If we could respond briefly?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: If I may just conclude for a second.

MR. GOGGIN: Oh, I'm sorry. Sorry.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: I started to say that ICG regards this as a preventive measure and our hope would be that no occasion would ever rise under which those provisions would be triggered because we see this as overcoming what would otherwise be an incentive for any ILEC to not uphold its end of the agreement. And because there is no adequate remedy,

in terms of either visits to this Commission or to a court of law any time there is failure to meet a deadline, we see this as an opportunity for the Commission to exercise its authority under state law to prevent anticompetitive behavior by building into the agreement, teeth, if you will; some remedies in the event of a breach.

Follow-up point is this. Consider that

BellSouth is trying to have it both ways. They say

that the Commission cannot -- doesn't have

jurisdiction to consider provisions for liquidated

damages. But I've also asked you to take official

recognition of an excerpt from their general

subscriber tariffs. And you'll see sprinkled

throughout their tariffs are provisions for

limitations of liability. And while this is from the

general subscriber tariff, if you pick up any

negotiated interconnection agreement you'll also find

the limitation of liability in those agreements as

well.

And on the one hand, they say to the Commission, we want you to approve a provision that limits liability. Well, our request that you provide some measures for liquidated damages is part of the same subject. Both go to the scope of liability. And

to suggest that this Commission doesn't have jurisdiction over the scope of liability is simply to fly in the face of the very tariffs that they submitted for approval. Those are my arguments.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: BellSouth.

MR. GOGGIN: Yes. I would like to respond to the issues that he's raised in the order that he brought them up.

First with regard to what I'll call the odd numbered liquidated damages issues, I believe it's what formerly was Issue 21, 23, 25 and 19 also in the prehearing order. I mean in the -- excuse me. In the procedural order.

Each of them is worded in the same way.

Should BellSouth continue to be responsible when, for example, in Issue 21, the duration of service failure exceeds certain benchmarks. Well, the service failure in Issue 21 is related to the service failure for which liquidated damages are proposed to be imposed under Issue 20. And the words "continue to be responsible" can only lead one to believe that Issue 21 was designed to refer back to Issue 20.

So we think that the -- although the argument made here that there needs to be some way for BellSouth to be responsible under the contract for

service failures, for example, really isn't what issues the odd numbered issues, 21, 23, 25, are dealing with. The plain wording of those issues makes it clear that what they're talking about is, should there be additional damages that would apply when the failure referred to in the prior issue continues.

б

On the general issue of BellSouth's responsibility, it is responsible for meeting the obligations in its agreements, and as the plethora of ISP reciprocal compensation cases makes clear, there are ways for ALECs to use the procedures of the Commission to ensure that ILECs abide by the obligations of their contracts, even if BellSouth doesn't always agree on what the scope of those obligations may be.

Secondly, with regard to the issue of whether any of these issues is appropriate for two-party arbitration, while the order of the events may not be clear -- and if you need additional clarification on what happened in North Carolina or Alabama I believe Mr. Edenfield was present at both those arbitrations and could fill you in. But even in this case, they've sponsored testimony that says that these issues would be more appropriate for consideration in a generic proceeding then they would

for a two-party arbitration.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's me interrupt you.

Mr. McGlothlin, is that your position both with the

notion of stating that BellSouth continue to be

responsible and the liquidated damages? Is it the

testimony that both of them are more appropriate for a

generic proceeding?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We would be willing to incorporate all of those issues into the request for generic proceeding.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. GOGGIN: So, in other words, to the extent that one would argue that the circumstances in Alabama or North Carolina might have been different, what is clear is that the issues in those cases were virtually verbatim with the issues here and the position taken by ICG was, at least in North Carolina, virtually verbatim with the position that they've taken in their testimony in this case.

Under the circumstances, it's difficult for us to understand why they would wish to pursue the issues here, when by their own admission, they think it would be more appropriate to pursue these issues in another proceeding.

Third was the point that they made that

they're not really asking the Commission to award damages so that the prior precedents don't necessarily apply. The rulings of the Commission that these issues are not appropriate for arbitration all come out of the AT&T arbitration. When these issues were, in fact, arbitrated they were not excluded from the case at the prehearing stage. They actually went through arbitration on this issue and were removed from the case later.

The Commission concluded that "we should limit our consideration in this arbitration proceeding to the items enumerated to be arbitrated in Sections 251 and 252 of the Act and matters necessary to implement those items. A liquidated damages provision does not meet that standard."

The Commission went on to state that "it is not appropriate for us to arbitrate a liquidated damages provision under state law. If we did we would be, in effect, awarding damages to one party for a breach of contract. We lack the authority to award money damages."

The distinction that they attempt to draw between asking for liquidated damages to be put into a contract and actually awarding damages as a result of a litigation is really a distinction without a

difference because the jurisdiction to enforce or construe these agreements also rests with the Commission, so imposing a liquidated damages provision in a contract would be tantamount to awarding damages, certainly if that issue ever came before the Commission to be decided.

So we think that the decisions of the Commission have been the correct decisions and nothing about this case that we've heard so far has identified this case as being any different than -- in either the facts or the issues presented, than any of the other cases in which the Commission has repeatedly found that these issues should be excluded from the arbitration.

In fact, the most recent order, I believe, in which liquidated damages were removed from an arbitration was the Media One arbitration in the prehearing conference that occur on June 22, 1999.

Third, as to whether there needs to be some sort of -- I guess this is fourth. As to whether there needs to be some sort of preventive measure to prevent anticompetitive behavior, there are statutes that this Commission is responsible for enforcing that prohibit anticompetitive behavior. There are state and federal antitrust laws, and all of these remedies

are available to an ALEC who believes that BellSouth is acting in a manner that is anticompetitive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And lastly, with respect to the tariff provisions that include limited liability provisions, those provisions were voluntarily entered into by BellSouth. BellSouth filed a tariff. The tariff was approved.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, let me ask you this question. Who determines whether or not -- even though we have approved that, is that the final say on the limit of your liability?

MR. GOGGIN: Yes. Under the filed tariff doctrine, if a court were faced with a claim for damages that exceeded the amounts set forth in the tariff, it's my understanding that under the filed tariff doctrine, plaintiff would not be entitled to receive those remedies. The courts generally will observe the filed tariff and will not go beyond the limitations and liability in the tariff.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Even if there's gross negligence?

MR. GOGGIN: In the tariff itself it says that the limitations and liability don't apply if gross negligence is found.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, I guess my

question is, that that is not something -- the liability is not something that we would determine. The extent of your liability is something the court would determine, and one of your defenses would be that it's a filed rate, not that it's been approved by us.

MR. GOGGIN: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Anything else?

MR. GOGGIN: Nope. That's all. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: With respect to the continue to be responsible, I still am sort of -- it strikes me that the extent of the responsibility that BellSouth may bear for not living up to the requirements of the contract is going to be adjudicated by a court and be a factual determination that they would make. What does it add to say they'll continue to be responsible? What does that get you?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Commissioner, I think we got into this for the first time during the issue ID meeting, and I think we're prepared to say that the wording was not the most artful. We attempted to clarify the intent for the Staff during that time.

I've referred to it again on Page 1 of our response, second -- third paragraph. I state, "Issue Nos. 5 and 18 through 25 relate to BellSouth's refusal to

negotiate standards and consequences, as well as its refusal to negotiate provisions which would require BellSouth to acknowledge its responsibility for customer difficulties resulting from BellSouth's failure to meet performance standards."

It has always been -- the intent has always been to have these issues relate to customer relationship issues that grow out of the situation in which ICG would rely on BellSouth. The customer is mad at ICG and yet there is no requirement that BellSouth acknowledge that the fault lies there and not with ICG's service.

So if the problem is that, as worded, that it's less than fully communicated, we can work on that. We can rephrase it. But, by no means do I think that BellSouth has made the case that they should be removed from the case.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Does Staff have any recommendation?

MR. FORDHAM: On those odd issues that seem to be follow-ups to the even issues, I share the Commissioner's question that I don't know exactly what that adds. On the even number issues regarding liquidated damages, it's obvious that if those issues were at this point not removed that would be

inconsistent with the precedent of this Commission on a number of cases. And, Commissioner Clark, you sat on the Media One case, which was just about a month ago, wherein the issue was removed at prehearing, the liquidated damages issues.

prepared to make a ruling that both issues will be removed from this prehearing but that is with the understanding that you can -- it's up to you whether or not to file a petition to ask for it to be treated generically and then the opportunity to make those arguments would be made in the petition and then the Commission could deal with that on a generic basis because it strikes me it goes to a similar issue in -- with respect to a customer -- concern about the customers and service provided to the customers and what are the consequences of failure to provide that service by BellSouth as it impacts both ICG and the customers. So I will grant the motion to strike those issues.

MR. FORDHAM: Commissioner, for clarification, that would be Issue 4 and then Issues 8 through 15 on the draft prehearing order.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there any dispute as to those being the appropriate issues?

Okay. Let's go to Issue 5. Any changes?

Let me just ask, on the bottom of -- the last line of

ICG's position it says, "of for extended terms".

Should that be an "or"? Do I have the right copy of

the prehearing order. I think so.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: I think you're correct. It should be "or".

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Issue 6. Any changes there?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: None from ICG.

question on Issue 7. It is framed, "should BellSouth be required to commit to provisioning the requisite network buildout and necessary support when ICG agrees to enter into a binding forecast." And then both of the answers deal with agreeing to a binding forecast as opposed to whether they should be required to provision when ICG agrees to enter into a binding forecast.

What is it -- here's what I interpreted it.

You're willing to say to them, we will bind ourselves
to this forecast and if you provision the facilities,
we will pay for it. The question becomes, if you're
willing to do that, are they required to provision it.

And I'm not sure that's what it says or the answers

say.

MR. EDENFIELD: On behalf of BellSouth, if you'd like me to respond, Commissioner Clark.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That would be good.

MR. EDENFIELD: The first issue is, is
BellSouth required. In other words, if ICG wants to
enter into a binding forecast is BellSouth then
obligated to accept and then enter into a binding
agreement for certain facility buildout. Once you get
to that point, then I think you're right on track, and
that is, if the parties agree to that, is BellSouth
then bound to comply with that agreement.

But I think the preliminary question is, is there some obligation -- just because ICG wants to enter into a binding forecast, is there some obligation on BellSouth to accept that binding forecast or to enter into a binding forecast if BellSouth does not want to.

commissioner clark: All right. Then you need to -- then Issue 7 needs to be restated. And it should be, should BellSouth be required to enter into a binding forecast and, therefore, be required to --

MR. GOGGIN: We had asked that this issue be broken into two questions at the issue ID, but we didn't carry the day on that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Mr. McGlothlin, do you want to respond?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: I believe you're correct in your observation that there will be two steps; first the binding forecast to which ICG would commit, and if ICG so commits our position is that BellSouth would be required to provision accordingly.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, let me ask

BellSouth this. Is it your -- if we require you to

commit to a binding forecast, do you dispute that you

would then be required to commit provisioning in the

requisite network buildout to support that commitment.

MR. EDENFIELD: The short answer to your question is, no, I don't dispute that, but there are a lot of little idiosyncrasies that go with that.

In other words -- and this is the issue that has come up during our discussions. In Atlanta, one of the busiest central offices is right in downtown, in Buckhead. Suppose ICG comes in and says, I want, you know, 5,000 loops or make it ports in the Buckhead office and we just don't have it. In other words, now you've required us to enter into a binding forecast. They've sent us the forecast saying I want this --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: No. No. I'm saying -MR. EDENFIELD: -- and the facilities don't

exist. I don't know that it's possible for us to comply and do the requisite buildout. That's one of the problems that we've had is, if it's a one way binding forecast, in other words, ICG can just come in and basically impose it upon us, then there is no guarantee that the facilities will be available, that they will be available in the time perimeters, and these are all the little things we've been trying to work out on the side.

But the short answer to your question is, yes, if you require us to do it, we will have to do it, but there's got to be something there that if it's not possible we have some recourse.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, then the issue strikes me as being, what are the circumstances under which you will not be required to enter into a binding forecast.

MR. EDENFIELD: Well, from BellSouth's position the question is, is it something required by the Act. And this is what we've been arguing in some of the different states, and the North Carolina staff has already kind of gone our way on this and said there's nothing in the Act that requires you to enter into a binding forecast, therefore, it's not appropriate for arbitration, which is basically where

we are.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask this. Is it appropriate then to word the issue this way: Should BellSouth be required to enter into a binding forecast with respect to IGC -- ICG's traffic requirements and thereby be required to commit to provisioning the requisite network buildout and necessary support?

MR. EDENFIELD: I think I would -- I think the order of that is fine. I think I would break it into two sentences. One, is BellSouth required or does the 1996 Act require BellSouth to enter into a binding forecast. Period. If so, is BellSouth then required to do the necessary requisite buildout --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's fine.

MR. EDENFIELD: -- as a separate issue that has to be addressed and not just a given from one to the other.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Will that work,
Mr. McGlothlin?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We have resisted efforts to phrase these issues in terms of does the 96 Act require, because at some point we have to reach that aspect that says the Commission should require those things that are necessary to implement. And some things may be explicit, other things may be implicit.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Well, then we 1 can just say, is BellSouth required to enter into the 2 contract if -- the binding forecast. If so, are they 3 then required to commit to provisioning the requisite 4 network buildout and necessary support. And then they 5 6 can answer it, no, they're not required to do by the 7 1996 Act, and you can answer it, it's implicit that they be required to do such thing to carry out the 8 9 purposes. Is that --10 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: That's acceptable. 11 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Now, you know, I have 12 no -- I think that can be one issue, or it can be two. MR. FORDHAM: We can make it an A and B, 13 Commissioner. 14 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That would be fine. 16 But I just -- there was a disconnect for me in terms 17 of what the dispute was. 18 Okay. The rest of the issues we've already 19 stricken; is that correct? 20 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Correct. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Anything to change on the exhibit list? Okay. Then there are no 22 23 further changes to the --24 MR. GOGGIN: Commissioner Clark, if I can

just note that we were -- we got a draft of this just

25

before you called the meeting to order, so we're 1 2 reading through it as we're talking here. If we later 3 come up with a typo, can we submit it to the group? 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Nope. 5 MR. EDENFIELD: Speak now or forever hold your peace kind of thing. 6 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No. Of course. 8 looked through it. The only things that -- we have dealt with the motion to remove the issues. We need 9 to deal with the motion to strike the testimony. Of 10 course, there would be an opportunity for both parties 11 to look at it and see if we made typos or if there is 12 some other error that you didn't catch. That is not a 13 license to change your positions to any substantive 14 amount, and if you do, we'll have to come back and 15 talk about it. 16 17 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Ms. Kaufman reminds me that 18 the exhibit of Karen Notsund goes to the proposal of a 19 generic docket. 20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. We will delete that. 21 22 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Right. 23 MR. GOGGIN: We will also, to the extent that we have information that we've submitted that 24

relates to issues that have been withdrawn, we can go

25

ahead and --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. Mr. McGlothlin, it seems that it would be appropriate to strike some testimony on the basis that we've removed some issues.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: I think all of Ms. Notsund's testimony is in that category.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. So we will delete her as a witness and we'll delete her exhibit.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: There would also be a need to edit Mr. Holdridge's testimony.

provide that -- you know, give it the other parties and then we'll take it up as that -- I'm trying to think. If we can reach agreement on what can be stricken, why don't we add that to the prehearing order that says, based on these issues being resolved, the testimony has -- one set of testimony and exhibit has been withdrawn and the following prefiled testimony has been stricken.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We'll work on that.

MR. EDENFIELD: I don't know if this will be a help or not, but my recollection of -- I've tried this case twice already; that the testimony is laid out almost by section so it should not be that difficult to find and take that out. And also

Mr. Holdridge has a performance measurements exhibit 1 2 as well, just so you know Mr. McGlothlin. And I 3 believe that there is testimony if it held true for 4 Florida, which I don't remember off the top of my 5 head, that Mr. Starkey had also filed some performance 6 measurements testimony, but I could be mistaken. 7 might want to look there as well. 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 9 MR. FORDHAM: Excuse me. Is all of 10 Holdridge's testimony regarding the performance 11 measures? 12 MS. KAUFMAN: No. 13 MR. GOGGIN: If you look at the beginning, 14 you know. 15 MR. FORDHAM: Okay. 16 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That leaves the motion 17 to strike some of Mr. Varner's testimony, and as I 18 understand it, I have the motion, but I don't have a 19 response; is that correct? 20 MR. EDENFIELD: We filed a response --21 MR. GOGGIN: On Friday. 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Fordham, did you 23 give me that? 24 MR. FORDHAM: Commissioner --25 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, you did.

1 MR. FORDHAM: Yes. Right after --2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: It was the one with the 3 stamp on it, right? 4 MR. FORDHAM: Yes. Correct. 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: This one. 6 MR. FORDHAM: Correct. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I did read it. 8 sorry. 9 MR. GOGGIN: Short but forgettable. 10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, it wasn't. 11 apologize. I did read it. See. 12 MR. EDENFIELD: Oh, no, there is 13 highlighting. I'm in trouble. 14 MR. GOGGIN: Kip is going to handle this 15 motion for us. 16 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. McGlothlin. 17 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Yes. This is my motion. 18 Commissioner, by way of background, during 19 negotiations ICG sought to negotiate with BellSouth a 20 provision that would include ISP traffic within the 21 reciprocal compensation mechanism. BellSouth refused 22 to agree to such a measure. As a result, when ICG 23 filed its petition it included this issue, which 24 became the first issue of the prehearing statement; "Until the FCC adopts a rule with prospective 25

application, should dial-up calls to Internet Service

Providers be treated as if they were local calls for

purposes of reciprocal compensation."

BellSouth filed a response in which it said, "No, reciprocal compensation is not applicable to ISP-bound traffic."

Now, few things are more certain than the perimeters that the 96 Act provides with respect to those issues that can be arbitrated. The Act says that they are limited to those that arise from the petition and the response to the petition. Yet in BellSouth's testimony, Mr. Varner -- Mr. Varner says ICG should be required to pay BellSouth a portion of the revenues it receives from ISP providers because BellSouth is jointly providing exchange access service to ISPs.

In a situation in which the FCC has dealt with ISP traffic and has indicated more than once the -- its view that the state Commissions have the ability to include ISP traffic as local for purposes of reciprocal compensation, this idea comes way from left field. It really has the effect of standing the regulation on its head.

But, beyond that -- and we've addressed -- we were required to address the testimony and

prefiled -- and rebuttal testimony because of the timing of the case schedule.

But, our point is that we shouldn't reach that point at the hearing because while we can admire the radical nature of the proposal, audacity does not buy BellSouth an exemption from the requirements that it seek to arbitrate issues only that arise from the petition or the response to the petition.

Now, I've had a chance to look at their response and I'd like to make three quick observations.

BellSouth would have the Commission believe that Issue 1 really just raises a subject of interim mechanisms and we've got one and they've got another. But that's not the case. Issue 1 posed only the question of whether ISP traffic should be treated as local for reciprocal compensation.

Next, they say that we're quibbling over nuances of testimony. Well, to say black is white or that east is west is not a nuance. They are trying to completely flip the issue and make what was a one way street --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. McGlothlin, the answer for me -- the point they make that in your petition at Page 8, you say that Issue 1 requires the

Commission to fashion in this proceeding a mechanism that includes ISP traffic for purposes of reciprocal compensation for cost incurred in handling. That's the way I see it represented. This is one mechanism as opposed to continuing to identify it as local.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: I'm sorry. I guess I missed part of that question, Commissioner.

at Page 2. Answer the question where your petition allegedly says that Issue 1 requires the Commission to fashion in this proceeding a mechanism that includes ISP traffic for purposes of reciprocal compensation for cost incurred in handling the calls.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Well, that's true as far as it goes. We asked the Commission to conclude that ISP traffic should be treated as local for purposes of reciprocal compensation.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And, I guess, why is it not appropriate for them to say it shouldn't be treated as local and this is how it should be treated?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Because the issue as framed, arising from negotiations, stops at the point, is it local for purposes of reciprocal compensation or not. Had they wished to make the case that ICG has to pay them money because this is jointly provided

exchange access, that should have been in the response or in a petition that they had the ability to file under the Act as well.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. And this isn't just saying -- this isn't just a rationale for their view that it should not be local traffic?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: No. It goes far beyond that. They're trying to make a completely different proposition out of it.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: So the petition and the response did not create an opportunity for either party to propose mechanisms that go in different directions. It only asks the question, is it going to be local for purposes of reciprocal compensation or not. And again, that's not a nuance.

And the final observation is this. We've said in our pleading that the parties -- that this proposition did not arise during negotiations, and Mr. Holdridge is here and if necessary he can speak to this. And categorically BellSouth did not raise this during the negotiations that occurred at any point prior to the filing of a petition. And we'll stand by that, but that's actually neither here nor there because the framework of the Act says that you find

your issues in the petition and the response.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Goggin or Mr. Edenfield. Who is going to argue this?

MR. EDENFIELD: Mr. Edenfield.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okav.

is trying to do in short is frame an issue in such a way that only they get to file testimony concerning it. And I think you picked up on the key, and that is, on footnote 1 on Page 3 of ICG's motion to strike they talk about what the Commission has been asked to do in responding Issue 1; is to develop the mechanism by which reciprocal compensation will or will not be paid going forward. And I guess you have to back up a little bit and look at this in terms of, the Commission to date has looked at interpretations of existing interconnection agreements to determine what the parties' obligations are as concerns reciprocal compensation.

What you're looking at here is the same thing that you looked at in Media One, and that is, in the context of negotiating a new agreement where it's obvious what the intent of the parties are, and that is, obviously, on the opposite ends of the spectrum, what intercarrier compensation mechanism is the

Commission going to put in place pending the FCC's determination of its plan. Without getting into the merits of jurisdiction and this, that and the other, that is what they've asked you to do.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask you this. Suppose we agree with you that your mechanism is the right way to do it. Do we have the authority to impose it?

MR. EDENFIELD: I think on an interim basis,
yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's not something that is interstate access?

MR. EDENFIELD: Sure. It's interstate access, but then you get back to this jurisdictional argument of, the FCC in its February 26th order, the ISP order, apparently has granted to state commissions the authority to put into place an interim intercarrier compensation mechanism --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Putting aside whether they can grant that us that authority, I suppose.

MR. EDENFIELD: Right. And that's the part that I said I'm putting aside. I'm not sure one federal agency has the authority to grant power to a state agency or vice versa. But putting that aside for a moment, apparently the FCC has left, in the

interim, authority for the states to put into place
some type of intercarrier compensation mechanism until
they act, whenever that maybe.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question.
Who responds to Mr. Varner's testimony?

MR. EDENFIELD: Mr. -- well, actually

everyone, since Mr. Varner is our only witness. I'm sorry. We do have Ms. Caldwell. But basically Mr. Varner touches on all the issues.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Who responds -
MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Our witness is Mr. Starkey.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Does he respond to

anything else?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So they're going to be here anyway?

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm inclined to leave this motion to strike pending. And we'll make the note that we'll take it up at the beginning of the proceeding. Because I have -- while I've read the motions, I did not look at the testimony and, you know, it may be good information. I'm just not sure that we could act on it. So if we can't act on it, why would we take the information? It will give me

more time to think about it and be more -- be prepared 1 at least at the beginning, and then we will have three 2 3 Commissioners there; is that right? MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Yes. 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And maybe collectively 5 6 we can reach the right decision on it. I see no harm 7 in leaving it pending and probably we should indicate 8 the motion to strike is pending and it would be 9 appropriate to give the parties 3 to 5 minutes to argue it because I don't see it being a longer 10 argument than that. 11 12 MR. FORDHAM: Take it up as a preliminary 13 matter at the hearing? 14 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. Correct. 15 of course, you resolve it ahead of time. Anything 16 else we need to take up? 17 MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We would like a chance to 18 make a short opening statement. 19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. BellSouth. 20 MR. EDENFIELD: That's agreeable to BellSouth. 21 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. How long? MR. EDENFIELD: No more than an hour each. 23 24 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, if that's the

case, we can decide this case right now.

25

- 1	
1	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Seven minutes.
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that would be
3	good and that way perhaps the total is
4	MR. GOGGIN: Seven minutes net of the three
5	to five that we have on the motion.
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Not more than ten
7	minutes collectively. Is that the right word? In
8	total.
9	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Three to five, that is
LO	seven it's 10 to 12.
Ll	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. The shorter the
12	better. But let's indicate that they've requested the
13	opportunity to make a short statement and to argue the
14	motions to strike.
L5	MR. FORDHAM: And you've granted seven
16	minutes for opening statements.
۲7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, let's put it at
18	five.
19	MR. FORDHAM: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Five for both.
21	MR. FORDHAM: Five each.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Right. Five for each
23	party, five for each motion or five for each issue,
24	the presentation and the motion. Okay.
25	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: All right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think you can do 1 that. 2 MR. GOGGIN: If we use one minute on the 3 motion can we have nine minutes? 4 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, take that up with 6 Commissioner Deason who will be chairing the hearing. 7 Anything else we need to take up? And this hearing is 8 scheduled for when? MR. GOGGIN: October 7th and 8th. 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Good. We'll see 10 you then. 11 MR. FORDHAM: Commissioner, a mechanical 12 question here. We had for the first time on the draft 13 prehearing order renumbered the issues as they have 14 been removed for whatever reason and I suppose I 15 16 should ask whether that's the Commissioner's pleasure to continue to do that, and as we remove these issues 17 today, renumber accordingly. 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. Renumber them as 19 they're removed so we would have, I don't know how 20 21 many issues. Five maybe? 22 MR. FORDHAM: We'll boil down to six issues. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Let me be clear. 24 With respect to the last issue, will you have it rephrased and then have the parties' positions -- you 25

1	should submit that no later than close of business
2	tomorrow.
3	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: Which issue are we speaking
4	about?
5	MR. FORDHAM: We're going to break that
6	into, as I understand it, an A and B component. In
7	essence, two questions on the one issue.
8	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We can respond to that
9	quickly, yes.
10	MR. FORDHAM: We'll do a real quick
11	turnaround on that.
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me put it this way.
13	Given where the hearing is, I don't think there's any
14	need to rush you all, but I don't want to rush the
15	Staff either. Would Friday be fine for that?
16	MR. FORDHAM: I would hope it would be
17	because all of next week I will be gone and the
18	following Monday, and my first day back after Friday
19	will be the day of the hearing.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, if there's no
21	objection to having it by the close of business
22	tomorrow, that would be helpful.
23	MR. MCGLOTHLIN: I think we can do that.
24	COMMISSIONER CLARK: What else did we need
25	done? And at the same point, the close of business

tomorrow, if you've noticed any other errors in the 1 prehearing order you'll let us know. 2 3 MR. FORDHAM: May I ask, were these not 4 circulated to the parties, the draft prehearing order? 5 MS. KAUFMAN: No, they were not. MR. MCGLOTHLIN: We didn't see it. 6 MR. EDENFIELD: We were all in transit so it 7 could have made it to our offices. 8 MR. FORDHAM: I regret that. I had asked at 9 the time whether they were and it was represented to 10 me they had been distributed to you. 11 MR. EDENFIELD: I can say I did not, but I. 12 left early this morning so it could be sitting on my chair. 13 MR. FORDHAM: It should have been earlier. 14 We'll make certain that you get, of course, the 15 prehearing order as it's completed. 16 17 MR. EDENFIELD: There is one other of the 18 issues; our position that we are supposed to try to conform and that dealt with the UNEs and the fact that 19 20 it was the 319 order. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Close of business 22 tomorrow, too. I think there is nothing further and 23 this prehearing is adjourned. 24 (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at

25

2:45 p.m.)

1	STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	COUNTY OF LEON)
3	I, KIMBERLY K. BERENS, CSR, RPR, Official Commission Reporter,
4	1
5	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 990691-TP was heard by Prehearing Officer at the time and place hereir
6	stated; it is further
7	CERTIFIED that I stenographically report
8	the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed by me; and that this transcript,
9	consisting of 51 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
10	DATED this 23rd day of September, 1999.
11	
12	
13	KIMBERLY KO BERENS, CSR, RPR Florida Public Service Commission Official Commission Reporter
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

* 1/9, 1/10, 1/11, 1/12 1/9, 1/12 1 6/1, 27/23, 41/13, 41/15, 41/25, 42/10, 44/10, 44/12 10 48/10 117 2/4 12 48/10 15 29/23 150 2/8 152 1/20 18 13/5, 27/25 19 12/10, 21/11 1996 34/11, 35/7 1999 1/17, 25/18 1:30 1/18, 3/2 2 2 6/12, 42/9 20 13/5, 21/20, 21/22 21 1/17, 12/11, 21/11, 21/16, 21/18, 21/22, 22/2 13/5, 25/18 23 12/11, 21/11, 22/2 24 13/5 25 12/11, 21/11, 22/2, 27/25 251 24/13 252 2540 2/12 26th 45/15 2:45 1/19, 51/25 - 3 3 8/13, 9/11, 44/10, 47/9 319 8/23, 9/2, 9/7, 51/20 32301 2/5, 2/9 32399-0870 2/13 4 4 5/9, 5/10, 5/15, 5/17, 11/4, 29/22 400 2/8 4075 1/21 5 5/17, 13/4, 27/24, 30/1, 47/9 5,000 32/20 51 52/8 6 6 4/21, 5/11, 18/4, 30/8 7 7 30/11, 30/12, 31/20 7th 49/9 8 8 29/22, 41/25 8th 49/9 9 96 34/21, 40/8 990691 3/6 990691-TP 1/4, 52/5 A 18/20, 18/24, 24/1, 24/20

abide 22/12 ability 13/24, 40/20, 43/2 accept 31/8, 31/16 acceptable 35/10 access 40/15, 43/1, 45/12, 45/14 Act 11/19, 18/19, 24/13, 33/20, 33/23, 34/11, 34/21, 35/7, 40/8, 40/9, 43/3, 43/25, 46/3, 46/24 acting 18/18, 26/2 action 14/25 add 6/21, 13/19, 27/16, 37/15 added 9/6 address 15/21, 40/25 addressed 34/16, 40/24

adds 28/23 adequate 19/25 adjourned 51/23 adjudicate 19/1 adjudicated 18/11, 27/15 adjudication 13/13 admire 41/4 admission 14/20, 23/22 adopted 19/7 adopting 18/7 adopts 39/25 advocates 15/20 Affairs 3/17 agency 17/25, 18/5, 45/23, 45/24 agree 7/5, 18/13, 22/14, 31/11, 39/22, 45/6 agreeable 47/20 agreed 7/2, 18/25 agreeing 30/16 agreement 6/25, 13/8, 19/25, 20/6, 20/18, 31/9, 31/12, 37/14, 44/22 agreements 11/21, 18/22, 20/19, 22/9, 25/2, 44/17 agrees 30/14, 30/18 Alabama 14/15, 14/24, 15/11, 15/12, 22/21, 23/14 ALEC 26/1 ALECs 22/11 allegedly 42/10 allow 11/7 amendment 10/4 amount 36/15 amounts 26/14 announced 9/7 answer 7/23, 32/13, 33/10, 35/6, 35/7, 41/24, 42/9 answers 30/16, 30/25 anticipated 16/3 anticompetitive 20/5, 25/22, 25/24, 26/2 antitrust 25/25 apologize 39/11 appearance 3/23 APPEARANCES 2/1, 3/11 applicable 15/24, 40/5 application 40/1 apply 22/5, 24/3, 26/23 appropriate 5/6, 12/3, 14/8, 15/5, 15/6, 15/7, 16/15, 22/17, 22/24, 23/6, 23/23, 24/4, 24/17, 29/25, 33/25, 34/3, 37/3, 42/19, 47/9 appropriately 8/5 approval 21/4 approve 20/22 approved 26/7, 26/10, 27/5 arbitrate 17/14, 24/17, 41/7 arbitrated 7/1, 11/24, 12/4, 14/25, 15/5, 24/6, 24/12, 40/9 arbitration 1/5, 3/7, 15/8, 16/18, 19/9, 22/18, 23/1, 24/4, 24/5, 24/8, 24/11, 25/14, 25/17, 33/25 arbitrations 11/18, 22/22 argue 11/7, 11/16, 23/13, 44/3, 47/10, 48/13 arguing 14/18, 33/20 argument 17/19, 21/24, 45/15, 47/11 arguments 17/21, 18/1, 21/4, 29/12 arise 40/10, 41/7, 43/19 arises 16/16 arising 42/22 Arnold 2/4 artful 27/21 articulated 7/7 aspect 7/9, 34/23 AT&T 18/7, 19/12, 24/5 AT&T's 18/5, 18/13 Atlanta 32/17 attempt 6/17, 24/22 attempted 27/21 attorney 3/23, 3/25 attribute 14/5 audacity 41/5 authority 17/13, 18/18, 18/20, 20/4, 24/20, 45/7, autilotty 7/73, 16123, award 11/23, 16/22, 16/25, 17/7, 17/11, 17/13, 18/10,

В

awarding 17/23, 24/19, 24/24, 25/4

background 39/18 based 37/16 basis 6/17, 7/6, 14/18, 15/9, 15/25, 29/13, 37/4, 45/9 bear 27/13 behavior 20/5, 25/22, 25/24 BellSouth 1/7, 2/9, 3/9, 3/12, 3/19, 6/16, 7/9, 7/23, 8/14, 8/16, 9/14, 11/13, 12/10, 12/18, 12/19, 12/24, 13/2, 13/24, 14/14, 16/21, 17/23, 19/12, 20/9, 21/5, 21/15, 21/25, 22/13, 23/4, 26/1, 26/6, 27/13, 28/3,

28/9, 28/11, 28/16, 29/18, 30/12, 31/2, 31/6, 31/7, 31/11, 31/16, 31/18, 31/21, 32/6, 32/9, 34/4, 34/10, 34/11, 34/12, 35/2, 39/19, 39/21, 40/4, 40/13, 40/15, 41/6, 41/12, 43/21, 47/19, 47/21 BellSouth's 10/4, 11/11, 15/18, 22/7, 27/25, 28/4, 33/18, 40/12 benchmarks 21/17 BERENS 1/22, 52/3 Betty 1/20 bind 30/21 binding 30/15, 30/16, 30/18, 31/7, 31/8, 31/15, 31/16, 31/17, 31/22, 32/5, 32/10, 32/22, 33/4, 33/16, 33/24, 34/4, 34/12, 35/3 bit 11/14, 44/15 black 41/19 blamed 12/25 boil 13/8, 49/22 bottom 30/2 Boulevard, Tallahassee 2/13 bound 31/12 breach 16/24, 17/24, 20/7, 24/20 breached 13/9 breaches 19/1 break 34/9, 50/5 broken 31/24 brought 12/5, 21/8 Bruce 3/16 Bruce's 4/2 Buckhead 32/19, 32/20 build 14/1, 14/9 building 20/5 buildout 30/14, 31/9, 32/12, 33/2, 34/7, 34/13, 35/5 busiest 32/18 business 14/1, 50/1, 50/21, 50/25, 51/21 buy 41/6

C

c/o 2/7 call 21/9 calls 40/1, 40/2, 42/13 came 25/5 capabilities 7/22, 7/25 Carolina 15/12, 15/13, 15/15, 22/20, 23/14, 23/17, 33/21 carry 31/25, 35/8 case 13/24, 14/6, 14/24, 15/15, 15/18, 16/2, 16/23, 18/3, 22/23, 23/19, 24/7, 24/9, 25/9, 25/10, 28/16, 28/17, 29/3, 37/23, 41/2, 41/15, 42/24, 47/25 cases 17/2, 17/18, 22/10, 23/15, 25/12, 29/2 catch 4/2, 36/13 categorically 43/21 category 37/6 caveat 7/4 Center 1/20 central 7/11, 18/13, 18/16, 18/23, 32/18 CERTIFICATE 52/1 CERTIFIED 52/7 CERTIFY 52/4 chair 51/13 chairing 49/6 chance 41/9, 47/17 change 5/13, 5/14, 7/19, 8/11, 35/22, 36/14 changed 7/18 changes 5/25, 6/12, 6/13, 30/1, 30/9, 35/23 characterized 16/9, 18/5 choose 15/1 circulate 10/10 circulated 51/4 circumstances 14/16, 14/24, 23/13, 23/20, 33/15 cited 16/20, 17/22, 19/12 cites 15/18 claim 26/13 clarification 22/20, 29/22 clarify 10/8, 10/13, 27/22 clarity 12/9 CLARK 1/15, 3/3, 3/10, 3/22, 4/1, 4/6, 4/9, 4/15, 4/23, 5/3, 5/7, 5/12, 5/18, 5/25, 6/7, 6/10, 6/19, 7/15, 7/17, 8/9, 8/13, 8/25, 9/3, 9/12, 9/22, 10/7, 10/11, 10/24, 11/12, 12/7, 13/6, 13/16, 14/11, 14/20, 15/3, 16/11, 17/1, 17/9, 17/17, 18/15, 19/6, 19/13, 21/5, 23/2, 23/11, 26/8, 26/20, 26/25, 27/8, 27/10, 28/18, 29/2, 29/6, 29/24, 30/8, 30/11, 31/3, 31/4, 31/19, 32/1, 29/2, 29/6, 29/24, 33/14, 34/2, 34/14, 34/18, 35/1, 35/11, 32/8, 32/24, 33/14, 34/2, 34/14, 34/18, 35/1, 35/11, 35/15, 35/21, 35/24, 36/4, 36/7, 36/20, 37/2, 37/7, 37/11, 38/8, 38/16, 38/22, 38/25, 39/2, 39/5, 39/7, 39/10, 39/16, 41/23, 42/8, 42/18, 43/4, 43/10, 44/2, 39/10, 39/16, 41/23, 42/8, 42/18, 43/4, 43/10, 44/2, 44/5, 44/6, 45/5, 45/11, 45/19, 46/4, 46/10, 46/12, 46/15, 46/18, 47/5, 47/14, 47/19, 47/22, 47/24, 48/2, 48/6, 48/11, 48/17, 48/20, 48/22, 49/1, 49/5, 49/10, 49/19, 49/23, 50/12, 50/20, 50/24, 51/21 clear 7/24, 9/8, 9/20, 22/4, 22/10, 22/19, 23/15, 49/23 close 50/1, 50/21, 50/25, 51/21

collocate 7/11 collocated 8/4 column 5/21 Commenced 1/18 COMMISSION 1/1, 1/23, 2/12, 2/14, 3/21, 11/18, 11/22, 12/15, 13/12, 15/14, 15/15, 15/21, 16/1, 16/6, 16/7, 16/21, 16/22, 16/24, 17/5, 17/7, 17/22, 18/2, 18/4, 18/12, 20/1, 20/4, 20/10, 20/22, 21/1, 22/12, 24/1, 24/3, 24/10, 24/16, 25/3, 25/6, 25/8, 25/12, 25/23, 29/1, 29/13, 34/23, 41/12, 42/1, 42/10, 42/15, 44/11, 44/16, 45/1, 52/3 COMMISSIONER 1/15, 3/3, 3/5, 3/10, 3/15, 3/22, COMMISSIONER 1/15, 3/3, 3/5, 3/10, 3/15, 3/22, 4/1, 4/6, 4/9, 4/11, 4/15, 4/23, 5/3, 5/7, 5/11, 5/12, 5/18, 5/25, 6/7, 6/10, 6/19, 6/20, 7/15, 7/17, 8/9, 8/13, 8/25, 9/3, 9/9, 9/12, 9/22, 10/4, 10/7, 10/11, 10/24, 11/10, 11/12, 12/7, 12/9, 13/6, 13/16, 14/11, 14/20, 15/3, 16/11, 16/20, 17/1, 17/9, 17/17, 18/15, 19/6, 19/13, 21/5, 23/2, 23/11, 26/8, 26/20, 26/25, 27/8, 27/10, 26/20, 26/25, 27/8, 27/10, 26/20, 26/25, 27/8, 27/10, 26/20, 26/25, 27/8, 27/10, 26/20, 26/25, 27/8, 26/20 27/10, 27/18, 28/18, 29/2, 29/6, 29/21, 29/24, 30/8, 30/11, 31/3, 31/4, 31/19, 32/1, 32/8, 32/24, 33/14, 34/2, 34/14, 34/18, 35/1, 35/11, 35/14, 35/15, 35/21, 35/24, 36/4, 36/7, 36/20, 37/2, 37/7, 37/11, 38/8, 38/16, 38/22, 38/24, 38/25, 39/2, 39/5, 39/7, 39/10, 39/16, 39/18, 41/23, 42/7, 42/8, 42/18, 43/4, 43/10, 44/2, 44/5, 44/6, 45/5, 45/11, 45/19, 46/4, 46/10, 46/12, 46/15, 46/18, 47/5, 47/14, 47/19, 47/22, 47/24, 48/2, 48/6, 48/11, 48/17, 48/20, 48/22, 49/1, 49/5, 49/6, 49/10, 49/12, 49/19, 49/23, 50/12, 50/20, 50/24, 51/21 Commissioner's 6/15, 28/22, 49/16 Commissioners 47/3 Commissions 40/19, 45/16 commit 30/13, 32/5, 32/10, 32/11, 34/6, 35/4 commitment 32/12 commitments 13/21 commits 32/6 communicated 28/14 company 4/7 compensation 18/10, 22/10, 39/21, 40/3, 40/5, 40/21, 41/17, 42/3, 42/12, 42/17, 42/23, 43/15, 44/13, 44/19, 44/25, 45/18, 46/2 completed 51/16 comply 31/12, 33/2 component 50/6 concern 29/15 concerned 12/23 concerns 44/18 conclude 19/16, 42/15 Concluded 1/19, 18/13, 24/10, 51/24 conclusion 18/2, 19/11 conditions 18/21 CONFERENCE 1/14, 1/20, 25/18, 52/5 conform 51/19 Congress 18/18 consequences 28/1, 29/17 consideration 22/25, 24/11 consistent 15/17, 15/22 constitutes 52/8 construe 25/2 contain 12/16 context 12/5, 44/22 continue 6/16, 6/24, 12/19, 21/15, 21/20, 23/4, 27/11, 27/17, 49/17 continues 18/7, 22/6 continuing 42/5 contract 12/16, 13/2, 13/10, 13/18, 13/21, 17/24, 18/25, 21/25, 24/20, 24/24, 25/4, 27/14, 35/3 contracts 22/13 convened 3/2 CONVENIENCE 1/10 conversations 10/18 convey 16/5 COPY 1/10, 30/4 Correct 5/24, 6/10, 25/8, 30/6, 32/3, 35/19, 35/20, 38/19, 39/4, 39/6, 47/14 correctly 11/22 cost 42/3, 42/13 COUNTY 52/2 course 14/25, 36/7, 36/11, 47/15, 51/15 Court 9/1, 9/16, 10/25, 20/2, 26/13, 27/3, 27/15 courts 26/17 create 43/12 CSR 1/22, 52/3

D

customer 12/22, 12/25, 13/1, 13/25, 14/2, 14/3, 14/4,

14/9, 28/4, 28/7, 28/9, 29/15

customers 14/2, 29/16, 29/19

damage 11/20, 18/6, 18/10, 18/24 damages 11/5, 11/20, 11/24, 12/16, 13/4, 13/5, 16/10, 16/22, 16/25, 17/4, 17/7, 17/11, 17/13, 17/23, 18/8, 18/20, 19/3, 19/4, 20/12, 20/24, 21/10, 21/19,

22/5, 23/5, 24/2, 24/14, 24/18, 24/19, 24/21, 24/23, 24/24, 25/3, 25/4, 25/16, 26/14, 28/24, 29/5 DATE 1/17, 44/16 Davidson 2/3 day 31/25, 50/18, 50/19 days 10/15, 10/17 deadline 20/3 deal 29/13, 30/16, 36/10 dealing 22/3 dealt 36/9, 40/17, 51/19 Deason 49/6 decide 47/25 decided 11/22, 14/17, 25/6 decision 47/6 decisions 19/8, 25/7, 25/8 defenses 27/4 defined 8/16 definitions 9/17 Dekker 2/4 delete 36/20, 37/8 deleting 17/5 demonstrated 13/15 dependent 13/23 Describes 15/19 designed 18/21, 21/22 determination 13/9, 13/12, 19/4, 27/15, 45/2 determine 16/24, 27/2, 27/4, 44/17 determined 8/5 determines 26/9 develop 44/12 dial-up 40/1 difference 13/19, 13/22, 25/1 difficult 23/20, 37/25 difficulties 28/4 directions 43/14 disagreement 6/21 disconnect 35/16 discussions 6/16, 32/17 dispute 15/6, 29/24, 32/10, 32/14, 35/17 distinction 24/22, 24/25 distributed 51/11 divided 12/13 Division 2/12 DOCKET 1/4, 3/6, 12/6, 15/16, 36/19, 52/5 dockets 8/6 doctrine 26/13, 26/16 doesn't 20/10, 21/1, 22/14 downtown 32/18 draft 4/12, 4/22, 5/10, 29/23, 35/25, 49/13, 51/4 draw 24/22 duration 21/16 during 27/19, 27/22, 32/17, 39/18, 43/19, 43/22

E

EARL 2/7 Easley 1/20 east 41/20 EDENFIELD 2/7, 3/18 edit 37/10 effect 17/23, 24/19, 40/22 efforts 34/20 ELECTRONIC 1/10 elements 6/23, 7/3, 8/2 encompassed 11/2 end 5/4, 19/24 ends 44/24 enforce 18/21, 25/1 enforcing 25/23 enhanced 8/18 ensure 22/12 enter 30/15, 30/18, 31/7, 31/8, 31/15, 31/17, 31/21, 32/22, 33/16, 33/23, 34/4, 34/11, 35/2 entered 26/5 entitled 26/16 entrant 13/23 enumerated 24/12 equipment 8/4 error 36/13 errors 51/1 Esplanade 1/21 essence 50/7 established 11/2 event 8/6, 14/3, 18/9, 20/7 events 22/18 exceeded 26/14 exceeds 21/17 excerpt 20/13 exchange 40/15, 43/1 excluded 24/6, 25/13 excuse 21/12, 38/9 exemption 41/6

exercise 20/4

exhibit 35/22, 36/18, 37/8, 37/17, 38/1 exist 33/1 existing 44/17 expect 10/2, 10/15 explicit 34/25 extended 8/18, 30/3

F

face 21/3 faced 18/1, 26/13 facilities 30/22, 32/25, 33/6 facility 31/9 fact 7/20, 12/2, 14/14, 24/6, 25/15, 51/19 facts 25/11 factual 13/9, 13/11, 13/14, 27/15 fails 12/24 failure 15/19, 18/8, 20/2, 21/16, 21/17, 21/18, 22/6, 28/5, 29/17 failures 22/1 fashion 42/1, 42/11 fault 28/11 FCC 8/16, 9/6, 9/17, 10/18, 10/20, 39/25, 40/17, 45/15, 45/25 FCC's 45/1 February 45/15 federal 25/25, 45/23 field 40/22 file 29/10, 43/2, 44/8 filed 8/22, 26/6, 26/12, 26/15, 26/18, 27/5, 38/5, 38/20, 39/23, 40/4 filing 43/23 filings 11/6 fill 22/22 filling 13/20 find 20/18, 37/25, 43/25 finding 17/8 fine 10/24, 34/9, 34/14, 35/15, 50/15 fiscal 6/5, 6/9 five 48/5, 48/9, 48/18, 48/20, 48/21, 48/22, 48/23, flip 41/21 FLORIDA 1/1, 1/21, 2/5, 2/9, 2/11, 2/13, 3/21, 3/25, 38/4, 52/1 fly 21/3 folks 10/19 Follow-up 20/8 follow-ups 28/21 footnote 10/1, 44/10 FORDHAM 2/11, 3/20 forecast 30/15, 30/16, 30/19, 30/22, 31/7, 31/15, 31/17, 31/22, 32/5, 32/10, 32/22, 32/23, 33/4, 33/17, 33/24, 34/4, 34/12, 35/3 form 15/4 forums 12/1 found 25/12, 26/24 fourth 25/20 FPSC 1/23 frame 7/12, 44/7 framed 30/12, 42/22 framework 43/25 Friday 38/21, 50/15, 50/18 frustration 16/17 function 17/12

G

Gadsden 2/4
generic 12/5, 15/7, 15/16, 15/21, 16/8, 22/25, 23/7, 23/10, 29/13, 36/19
generically 8/19, 29/11
GOGGIN 2/7, 3/12
GORDON 2/2
Gotcha 9/3
Government 3/16
grafted 11/21
grant 29/19, 45/20, 45/23
granted 18/18, 45/16, 48/15
grew 16/17
gross 26/20, 26/24
Group 1/5, 2/6, 3/7, 12/13, 36/3
grow 28/8
guarantee 33/6
guess 4/18, 6/21, 6/24, 7/19, 9/12, 9/18, 11/4, 11/8, 25/20, 26/25, 42/6, 42/18, 44/14

H

H-O-L-D-R-I-D-G-E 4/5 hand 20/21 handle 39/14 handling 42/3, 42/13 happy 10/9, 11/7 harm 47/6 harmed 12/25 head 38/5, 40/23 held 11/18, 38/3 help 9/23, 37/22 helpful 50/22 highlighting 39/13 hold 36/5 Holdridge's 38/10 Honor 3/24 hope 19/20, 50/16 hour 47/23

30/10, 30/14, 30/18, 31/6, 31/14, 32/5, 32/6, 32/19, 33/4, 39/19, 39/22, 40/13, 42/24, 44/6
ICG's 7/8, 12/25, 28/12, 30/3, 34/5, 44/10
ID 27/19, 31/24 idea 40/21 identified 8/23, 25/9 identify 42/5 idiosyncrasies 32/15 IGC 34/5 ILEC 14/7, 19/24 ILECs 8/23, 13/24, 22/12 impacts 29/18 implement 24/14, 34/24 implicit 34/25, 35/7 importance 15/20, 16/7 impose 33/5, 45/8 imposed 21/19 imposing 25/3 incentive 19/24 inclined 46/18 inconsistent 29/1 incorporate 23/9 incorporated 17/4 incurred 42/3, 42/13 indicate 47/7, 48/12 indicated 40/18 information 6/15, 36/24, 46/23, 46/25 intent 27/22, 28/6, 44/23 intercarrier 44/25, 45/18, 46/2 interconnection 1/6, 3/8, 18/22, 20/18, 44/17 interest 14/21 interim 41/13, 45/9, 45/17, 46/1 Internet 40/1 interpretations 44/16 interpreted 12/19, 30/20 interrupt 13/6, 17/1, 23/2 interstate 45/12, 45/13 introduce 3/15 ISP 22/10, 39/20, 40/14, 40/18, 40/20, 41/16, 42/2, 42/12, 42/15, 45/16 ISP-bound 40/6 issue 4/17, 4/24, 6/1, 6/12, 7/7, 7/21, 8/7, 8/10, 8/13, 9/11, 11/4, 11/17, 11/25, 12/3, 12/17, 12/22, 17/8, 17/14, 21/11, 21/16, 21/18, 21/20, 21/21, 21/22, 22/6, 22/7, 22/16, 24/8, 25/5, 27/19, 27/24, 29/4, 29/14, 29/22, 30/1, 30/8, 30/11, 30/12, 31/5, 31/20, 31/23, 31/24, 32/16, 33/14, 34/3, 34/15, 35/12, 39/23, 39/24, 41/13, 41/15, 41/21, 41/25, 42/10, 42/21, 44/7, 44/12, 48/23, 49/24, 50/3, 50/7 issued 9/8, 9/10 issues 1/6, 3/8, 7/5, 8/5, 12/6, 12/10, 12/13, 14/15, 14/17, 14/25, 15/13, 15/25, 16/4, 16/7, 17/6, 21/7, 21/10, 22/2, 22/3, 22/17, 22/24, 23/9, 23/15, 23/16, 23/22, 23/23, 24/4, 24/5, 25/11, 25/13, 28/7, 28/8, 28/20, 28/21, 28/23, 28/24, 29/5, 29/7, 29/20, 29/22, 29/25, 34/21, 35/18, 36/9, 36/25, 37/4, 37/16, 40/9, 41/7, 44/1, 46/9, 49/14, 49/17, 49/21, 49/22, 51/18 items 7/13, 24/12, 24/14

1

ICG 1/5, 2/6, 3/7, 3/15, 3/17, 5/16, 5/23, 6/25, 7/2, 7/23, 8/4, 12/1, 12/15, 12/23, 12/25, 14/6, 14/14, 14/17, 15/12, 19/3, 19/19, 23/17, 28/9, 28/10, 29/18,

J

Joe 3/14, 5/20, 17/18 jointly 40/15, 42/25 JOSEPH 2/2 judicial 17/12 June 25/18 jurisdiction 11/23, 17/14, 20/11, 21/2, 25/1, 45/3 jurisdictional 45/14

K

Karen 36/18 KAUFMAN 2/3, 2/4, 3/15 key 44/9 KIMBERLY 1/22, 52/3 Kip 3/18, 39/14

L

lack 24/20 lacks 11/23 laid 37/23 later 24/9, 36/2, 50/1 law 11/23, 20/2, 20/4, 24/18 laws 25/25 lead 21/21 leave 8/9, 46/18 leaves 38/16 leaving 47/7 led 16/18 LEE 2/11, 3/20 left 40/22, 45/25, 51/13 legal 2/12 Legal 2/12 LEON 52/2 llability 20/16, 20/19, 20/23, 20/25, 21/2, 26/4, 26/11, 26/19, 26/23, 27/2, 27/3 license 36/14 licensed 3/25 lies 28/11 light 10/14 limit 24/11, 26/11 limitation 20/19 limitations 20/16, 26/19, 26/23 limited 16/5, 26/4, 40/10 limits 20/23 line 30/2 liquidated 11/5, 11/20, 12/16, 13/5, 16/10, 17/4, 18/5, 18/8, 18/19, 19/3, 20/11, 20/24, 21/10, 21/19, 23/5, 24/14, 24/17, 24/23, 25/3, 25/16, 28/24, 29/5 list 35/22 litigation 24/25 little 32/15, 33/8, 44/15 living 27/13 local 40/2, 40/20, 41/17, 42/5, 42/16, 42/20, 42/23, 43/6, 43/15 loops 8/15, 8/17, 32/20

M

mad 28/10 manner 26/2 Matter 1/4, 12/8, 47/13 matters 24/13 McGLOTHLIN 2/2, 2/3, 3/14 MCI 19/12 McWhirter 2/3 measure 19/5, 19/20, 25/21, 39/22 measurements 38/1, 38/6 measures 20/24, 38/11 mechanical 49/12 mechanism 39/21, 42/1, 42/4, 42/11, 44/12, 44/25, 45/6, 45/18, 46/2 mechanisms 41/14, 43/13 Media 25/17, 29/3, 44/21 meet 12/24, 18/8, 20/2, 24/15, 28/5 meeting 22/8, 27/20, 36/1 merits 45/3 MICHAEL 2/7, 3/12 minute 49/3 minutes 47/9, 48/1, 48/4, 48/7, 48/16, 49/4 mischaracterized 12/10 missed 42/7 misstated 17/10 mistaken 38/6 modify 14/25 moment 45/25 Monday 50/18 monetary 6/9 money 24/21, 42/25 Monroe 2/8 month 29/3 morning 51/13 motion 4/18, 4/25, 5/4, 11/6, 11/11, 12/10, 29/19, 36/9, 36/10, 38/16, 38/18, 39/15, 39/17, 44/10, 46/19, 47/8, 48/5, 48/23, 48/24, 49/4 motions 5/2, 46/22, 48/14 Mr. 46/6 MR. EDENFIELD 3/18, 3/22, 3/24, 10/16, 22/21, 31/2, 31/5, 32/13, 32/25, 33/18, 34/8, 34/15, 36/5, 37/21, 38/20, 39/12, 44/3, 44/4, 44/6, 45/9, 45/13,

45/21, 46/6, 47/20, 47/23, 51/7, 51/12, 51/17
MR. FORDHAM 3/3, 3/20, 4/9, 4/11, 4/19, 5/1, 5/5, 5/7, 5/10, 5/19, 5/24, 6/8, 9/9, 10/3, 28/20, 29/21, 35/13, 38/9, 38/15, 38/22, 38/24, 39/1, 39/4, 39/6, 47/12, 48/15, 48/19, 48/21, 49/12, 49/22, 50/5, 50/10, 50/16, 51/3, 51/9, 51/14
MR. GOGGIN 3/12, 6/20, 7/15, 7/16, 7/19, 8/12, 8/20, 9/1, 9/6, 9/19, 10/9, 11/14, 19/15, 19/18, 21/6, 23/12, 26/12, 26/22, 27/7, 27/9, 31/23, 35/24, 36/23, 38/13, 38/21, 39/9, 39/14, 44/2, 48/4, 49/3, 49/9
Mr. Holdridge 38/1, 43/20
Mr. Holdridge's 37/10
MR. MCGLOTHLIN 3/14, 4/4, 4/8, 5/14, 5/21, 6/3, 6/6, 6/13, 7/4, 10/12, 11/9, 11/10, 12/7, 12/8, 13/11, 13/22, 14/13, 14/22, 15/9, 16/14, 17/3, 17/15, 17/21, 18/17, 19/10, 19/14, 19/16, 19/19, 23/3, 23/8, 27/18, 30/6, 30/10, 32/1, 32/3, 34/19, 34/20, 35/10, 35/20, 36/17, 36/22, 37/2, 37/2, 37/5, 37/9, 37/20, 38/2, 39/16, 39/17, 41/23, 42/6, 42/14, 42/21, 43/7, 43/11, 46/11, 46/14, 46/17, 47/4, 47/17, 48/1, 48/9, 48/25, 50/3, 50/8, 50/23, 51/6
Mr. Starkey 38/5, 46/11
Mr. Varner 40/12, 46/7
Mr. Varner's 38/17, 46/5
Ms. Caldwell 46/8
Ms. Kaufman 36/17, 38/12, 51/5

N

name 4/3 Nancy 2/7 nature 41/5 necessary 24/13, 30/14, 34/7, 34/13, 34/24, 35/5, need 7/1, 22/19, 31/20, 36/9, 37/9, 47/16, 49/7, 50/14, 50/24 needs 21/24, 25/19, 25/21, 31/20 negligence 26/21, 26/24 negotiate 15/19, 28/1, 28/2, 39/19 negotiated 20/18 negotiating 44/22 negotiations 1/6, 3/8, 16/17, 39/19, 42/22, 43/19, neither 8/15, 43/24 net 48/4 network 30/14, 32/12, 34/7, 35/5 new 13/23, 18/3, 18/4, 44/22 nine 49/4 North 15/11, 15/13, 15/15, 22/20, 23/14, 23/17, 33/21 Nos 27/24 note 7/20, 12/1, 35/25, 46/20 Notice 3/4, 3/6 notion 23/4 Notsund 36/18 Notsund's 37/6 nuance 41/20, 43/16 nuances 41/19 number 28/23, 29/2 numbered 21/10, 22/2 nutshell 11/16

0

Oak 2/13 objection 9/23, 50/21 obligated 31/8 obligation 31/14, 31/16 obligations 22/9, 22/13, 22/15, 44/18 observation 32/4, 43/17 observations 41/11 observe 26/18 occasion 19/21 October 49/9 odd 21/9, 22/2, 28/20 offer 7/2, 7/10 office 7/11, 32/21 Officer 1/16, 52/5
offices 32/18, 51/8
OFFICIAL 1/11, 18/3, 20/12, 52/3 open 15/16, 16/7 opening 47/18, 48/16 opportunity 20/3, 29/11, 36/11, 43/12, 48/13 opposed 6/5, 10/14, 30/17, 42/5 opposite 44/24 orally 11/7 order 4/12, 4/13, 4/20, 4/21, 4/22, 5/10, 5/11, 5/13, 5/15, 8/7, 9/7, 9/8, 9/9, 10/15, 11/1, 19/12, 21/7, 22/12 25/15, 29/23, 30/5, 34/9, 36/1, 21/12, 21/13, 22/18, 25/15, 29/23, 30/5, 34/9, 36/1, 37/16, 45/15, 45/16, 49/14, 51/2, 51/4, 51/16, 51/20 orders 16/20, 17/22 outlined 4/13 overcoming 19/23

overrule 19/8 overturned 9/15, 9/16, 10/2, 11/1

P

p.m 1/18, 1/19, 3/2, 51/25 packet-switching 7/22 pages 52/8 paid 44/14 paragraph 18/14, 27/24 Part 4/21, 5/11, 17/15, 20/24, 42/7, 45/21 parties 10/10, 12/4, 31/11, 36/11, 37/12, 43/18, 44/23, 47/9, 51/4 parties' 44/18, 49/25 parts 12/14 party 17/24, 24/19, 43/13, 48/23 pay 30/23, 40/13, 42/25 peace 36/6 penalties 12/20 penalty 13/3 pending 45/1, 46/19, 47/7, 47/8
performance 12/24, 13/23, 15/19, 16/8, 28/5, 38/1, 38/5, 38/10 perimeters 33/7, 40/8 Period 34/12 permits 18/20 perspective 7/8
Petition 1/5, 3/7, 16/12, 16/13, 29/10, 29/12, 39/23, 40/11, 41/8, 41/25, 42/9, 43/2, 43/11, 43/23, 44/1 phrase 34/21 phrased 7/14 physical 6/3, 6/4 pick 20/17 picked 44/9 PLACE 1/20, 9/7, 45/1, 45/17, 46/1, 52/5 plaintiff 26/16 plan 45/2 pleading 43/18 pleasure 49/16 plethora 22/9 point 12/9, 12/23, 15/23, 16/4, 16/19, 16/23, 17/25, 18/23, 20/8, 23/25, 28/25, 31/10, 34/22, 41/3, 41/4, 41/24, 42/22, 43/22, 50/25 points 18/14, 18/16 policy 6/4 poor 14/4 portion 11/1, 40/13 ports 8/15, 8/17, 32/20 posed 41/15 position 6/3, 7/2, 7/20, 8/14, 8/22, 11/17, 23/3, 23/17, 23/18, 30/3, 32/6, 33/19, 51/18 positions 6/1, 6/14, 36/14, 49/25 possible 16/14, 33/1, 33/13 power 45/23 precedent 29/1 precedents 24/2 prefer 10/5 PREFILED 1/11, 37/18, 41/1 PREHEARING 1/14, 1/16, 3/6, 4/13, 4/22, 8/21, 9/20, 21/12, 24/1, 25/18, 29/4, 29/8, 29/23, 30/5, 37/15, 39/24, 49/14, 51/2, 51/4, 51/16, 51/23, 52/4, 52/5 preliminary 12/8, 31/13, 47/12 prepared 27/20, 29/7, 47/1 presentation 48/24 presented 25/11 preserve 16/4 President 3/16 prevent 20/5, 25/22 preventive 19/4, 19/20, 25/21 price 7/7 pricing 6/22, 7/5, 8/2, 8/4, 8/6 problem 28/13 problem 28/15
problems 33/3
procedural 8/7, 21/13
procedure 4/14
procedures 22/11
proceeding 14/15, 15/11, 15/12, 15/22, 19/7, 22/25, 23/7, 23/10, 23/24, 24/11, 42/11, 42/11, 46/21
PROCEEDINGS 1/14, 16/8, 19/9, 52/7
Professed 5/16 5/21 Proffered 5/16, 5/21 prohibit 25/24 proposal 7/9, 17/4, 36/18, 41/5 propose 5/14, 12/15, 43/13 proposed 4/14, 10/6, 21/19 proposition 16/21, 43/9, 43/19 provide 7/24, 8/17, 8/24, 13/25, 20/23, 29/17, 37/12 provider 14/5 Providers 40/2, 40/14 provides 40/8 provision 9/16, 13/1, 13/17, 13/20, 18/6, 18/19, 19/3, 20/22, 24/14, 24/18, 25/3, 30/18, 30/22, 30/24, 32/7, 39/20

provisioning 30/13, 32/11, 34/6, 35/4

provisions 11/21, 16/10, 18/22, 19/22, 20/11, 20/15, 26/4, 26/5, 28/2 PUBLIC 1/1, 2/11, 3/21, 10/21, 18/3 pull 14/17 purpose 16/5 purposes 35/9, 40/3, 40/20, 42/2, 42/12, 42/16, 42/23, 43/15 pursue 23/21, 23/23 put 13/8, 16/12, 24/23, 45/1, 45/17, 46/1, 48/17, 50/12 Putting 45/19, 45/22, 45/24

Q

quality 18/9 question 6/2, 7/7, 15/10, 19/7, 26/9, 27/1, 28/22, 30/12, 30/23, 31/13, 32/14, 33/10, 33/19, 41/16, 42/7, 42/9, 43/14, 46/4, 49/13 questions 8/1, 31/24, 50/7 quibbling 41/18 quick 41/10, 50/10

R

radical 41/5 raise 43/21 raised 21/7 raises 41/13 rate 27/5 rationale 43/5 reach 34/22, 37/14, 41/3, 47/6 reached 18/1, 19/11 read 3/3, 6/2, 11/6, 39/7, 39/11, 46/21 reading 36/2 reason 17/5, 19/14, 49/15 reasons 6/4, 14/17, 14/23, 15/24, 16/13 rebuttal 11/15, 41/1 recall 17/10 receive 26/17 receives 14/4, 40/14 reciprocal 22/10, 39/21, 40/3, 40/5, 40/21, 41/17, 42/2, 42/12, 42/17, 42/23, 43/15, 44/13, 44/18 recognition 14/22, 18/3, 20/13 recollection 37/22 recommend 5/8 recommendation 28/19 recommended 12/4 recourse 33/13 Reeves 2/3 refusal 27/25, 28/2 refused 39/21 regret 51/9 regulation 40/23 reissues 9/17 relate 27/25, 28/7 related 8/18, 21/18 relates 26/27 relates 36/25 relation-type 12/22 relationship 14/9, 28/8 relay 7/12 released 10/20, 10/21 relies 14/14 rely 28/9 remain 8/1 remaining 6/21 remedies 18/25, 20/6, 25/25, 26/17 remedy 19/25 remember 38/4 reminds 36/17 remove 4/25, 11/11, 36/9, 49/17 removed 24/8, 25/16, 28/17, 28/25, 29/4, 29/8, 37/4, 49/15, 49/20 renumber 49/18, 49/19 renumbered 49/14 rephrase 28/15 rephrased 49/25 REPORTED 1/22, 52/7 Reporter 1/23, 52/1, 52/3 represented 42/4, 51/10 representing 4/7 request 16/18, 18/5, 20/23, 23/9 requested 48/12 require 11/20, 12/15, 16/1, 28/2, 32/9, 33/11, 34/11, 34/22, 34/23 required 8/3, 8/24, 12/18, 30/13, 30/17, 30/24, 31/6, 31/21, 31/22, 32/7, 32/11, 32/22, 33/16, 33/19, 34/4, 34/6, 34/10, 34/13, 35/2, 35/4, 35/6, 35/8, 40/13, 40/25 requirement 28/10 requirements 27/14, 34/5, 41/6 requires 13/2, 14/1, 33/23, 41/25, 42/10 requisite 30/13, 32/12, 33/2, 34/7, 34/13, 35/4 resides 7/12 resisted 34/20

resolution 6/17 resolve 47/15 resolved 7/13, 37/16 resolving 7/6 respect 16/23, 26/3, 27/10, 29/15, 34/5, 40/8, 49/24 respond 9/11, 19/15, 21/6, 31/3, 32/2, 46/12, 50/8 responding 44/12 responds 46/5, 46/10 response 11/6, 12/13, 27/23, 38/19, 38/20, 40/4, 40/11, 41/8, 41/10, 43/1, 43/12, 44/1 responsibility 13/3, 14/6, 14/7, 22/8, 27/12, 28/3 responsible 12/19, 13/7, 13/13, 13/18, 13/20, 21/15, 21/21, 21/25, 22/8, 23/5, 25/23, 27/11, 27/17 rest 35/18 restated 31/20 rests 25/2 result 24/24, 39/22 revenues 40/14 rise 19/21 Room 1/20 RPR 1/22, 52/3 Rule 8/23, 9/2, 39/25 ruling 29/7 rulings 24/3 rush 50/14

sat 29/2 satisfactory 13/25, 14/9 satisfied 14/2 save 11/14 saw 9/24 scenarios 12/14, 12/17 schedule 18/8, 41/2 scheduled 49/8 scope 20/25, 21/2, 22/14 scratch 14/1 second 17/15, 18/23, 19/17, 27/24 section 37/24 Sections 24/12 seek 41/7 sent 32/23 sentences 34/10 separate 34/15 September 1/17 SERVICE 1/1, 2/11, 3/21, 13/25, 14/4, 18/4, 18/9, 21/16, 21/17, 21/18, 22/1, 28/12, 29/16, 29/18, 40/1, 40/15 Services 2/12 serving 14/5 set 18/24, 26/14, 37/17 Seven 48/1, 48/4, 48/10, 48/15 share 28/21 short 32/13, 33/10, 39/9, 44/7, 47/18, 48/13 shorter 48/11 Shumard 2/12 side 33/9 signed 4/2 Sims 2/8 sitting 51/13 situation 13/14, 15/23, 28/8, 40/17 six 49/22 sort 25/20, 25/21, 27/11 sought 39/19 South 2/4, 2/8 spectrum 44/24 sponsored 15/14, 22/23 sprinkled 20/14 stack 7/13 Staff 2/14, 27/22, 28/18, 33/21, 50/15 Staff's 6/14 stage 24/7 stamp 39/3 stand 43/23 standard 12/24, 24/15 standards 15/19, 16/9, 18/9, 28/1, 28/5 standing 40/22 standpoint 14/8 start 5/8, 11/8 started 19/19 state 10/25, 11/23, 20/4, 24/16, 24/18, 25/24, 27/24, 40/19, 45/16, 45/24, 52/1 statement 8/21, 9/20, 10/4, 39/24, 47/18, 48/13 statements 48/16 states 33/21, 46/1 statutes 25/22 Steen 2/4 stenographically 52/7 step 4/10 steps 32/4 stipulated 18/25 stops 42/22

Street 2/5, 2/8, 41/22 stricken 35/19, 37/15, 37/19 strike 4/18, 5/4, 29/19, 36/10, 37/3, 38/17, 44/10, 46/19, 47/8, 48/14 strikes 9/13, 9/14, 17/19, 27/12, 29/14, 33/15 subject 4/17, 4/24, 15/21, 20/25, 41/13 submit 36/3, 50/1 submitted 10/5, 21/4, 36/24 subscriber 20/14, 20/17 substantive 36/14 sufficient 14/23 Suite 2/8 support 30/14, 32/12, 34/7, 35/5 Supreme 9/1, 9/15, 10/25 SUSAN 1/15 switch 7/12

T

talk 36/16, 44/11 talking 22/4, 36/2 Tallahassee 1/21, 2/5, 2/8 tariff 20/17, 26/3, 26/6, 26/12, 26/15, 26/16, 26/18, 26/19, 26/22 tariffs 20/14, 20/15, 21/3 teeth 20/6 Telecom 1/5, 2/6, 3/7 Telecommunications 1/7, 2/10, 3/9, 3/13, 11/19 ten 48/6 terms 18/20, 20/1, 30/3, 34/21, 35/16, 44/15 TESTIMONY 1/11, 5/4, 6/2, 12/2, 15/18, 16/16, 22/23, 23/6, 23/19, 36/10, 37/4, 37/6, 37/10, 37/17, 37/19, 37/23, 38/3, 38/6, 38/10, 38/17, 40/12, 40/25, 41/1, 41/19, 44/8, 46/5, 46/22 Thank 3/10, 5/24, 27/9 Thereupon 51/24 they've 12/4, 22/23, 23/18, 32/23, 41/14, 45/4, 48/12 Third 23/25, 25/19, 27/24 three 10/22, 41/10, 47/2, 48/4, 48/9 TIME 1/18, 5/1, 8/10, 8/21, 10/13, 11/7, 11/15, 20/2, 27/19, 27/22, 33/7, 47/1, 47/15, 49/13, 51/10, 52/5 timing 41/2 top 38/4 touches 46/9 track 4/14, 31/10 traffic 34/5, 39/20, 40/6, 40/18, 40/20, 41/16, 42/2, 42/12, 42/16, 43/6 transcribed 52/8 TRANSCRIPT 1/10, 1/11, 52/8 transit 51/7 transport 8/3, 8/15 transports 8/18 transposition 5/22 treated 29/10, 40/2, 41/16, 42/16, 42/20 triggered 19/22 trouble 39/13 true 38/3, 42/14, 52/8 Tuesday 1/17 turn 15/10 turnaround 50/11 two 9/25, 10/19, 12/4, 12/13, 17/18, 18/13, 18/15, 31/24, 32/4, 34/10, 35/12, 50/7 two-party 15/5, 15/6, 15/8, 22/18, 23/1 type 13/13, 46/2 typo 5/15, 36/3 typos 36/12

U

UNE 8/6 UNEs 6/23, 7/3, 7/23, 7/25, 8/16, 8/23, 9/17, 11/3, 51/19 unresolved 1/6, 3/8 unsuccessful 16/17 uphold 19/24

V

vacated 9/2
valid 9/17
Varner 46/9
venue 16/16
verbatim 23/16, 23/18
versa 45/24
VERSIONS 1/10
Vice 3/16, 45/24
VICKI 2/2, 3/14
view 6/25, 16/6, 17/6, 19/2, 19/7, 40/19, 43/6
visits 20/1
voluntarily 15/2, 15/12, 15/25, 26/5

W

week 10/20, 50/17
weeks 10/19, 10/22
west 41/20
white 41/19
willing 23/8, 30/21, 30/24
wish 23/21
wished 42/24
withdraw 15/2, 16/1
withdrawn 12/6, 36/25, 37/18
withdrawn 12/6, 36/25, 37/18
withdrew 14/14, 15/13, 15/25
witness 15/14, 15/18, 16/5, 37/8, 46/7, 46/11
Witnesses 4/21, 5/11, 5/13, 5/15
word 34/3, 48/7
worded 7/1, 7/21, 8/7, 21/14, 28/13
wording 10/6, 22/3, 27/21
words 21/20, 23/12, 31/6, 32/16, 32/21, 33/4
work 6/24, 28/14, 33/9, 34/18, 37/20
wrong 18/11, 19/1
wrote 10/14

Y.

years 9/25 York 18/3, 18/4