1	HI OD IDA	BEFORE THE	CONTECTON			
2	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE	COMMISSION			
3			·			
4	In the Mat	ter of :	DOCKET NO.	991947-TP		
5	PETITION BY BELLSOU TELECOMMUNICATIONS,		; ;			
6	SECTION 252(B) ARBI RESOLUTION OF CERTA	TRATION SEEKING:	3		\$	
	ARISING IN NEGOTIAT	ION OF RESALE :				
7	AGREEMENT WITH FLOR SERVICES, LLC.	IDA TELEPHONE :		· 38 · 8 · 8	5	
8			-	7-13-13	2	
9	******	******	*****	*****		
10	* ELECTRO	NIC VERSIONS OF		IPT *		
11	* THE OFF	ONVENIENCE COPY ICIAL TRANSCRIPT	OF THE HEAR	ING *		
12	* AND DO *	NOT INCLUDE PREI	FILED TESTIMO	NY. * *		
13	*********					
14	PROCEEDINGS:	DDEUEADING CONE	יפס פארפ			
	PROCEEDINGS:	FREMEAKING CONF	ERENCE			
15	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER E.	LEON JACOBS	, JR.		
16		Prehearing Offi	cer			
17	DATE:	Wednesday Anri	1 26 2000			
18	DATE:	Wednesday, April 26, 2000				
19	TIME:	Commenced at 10				
20		Concluded at 1				
21	PLACE:	Betty Easley Co Room 152	onference Cen	ter		
22		4075 Esplanade Tallahassee, Fl	-			
	DDDODWDD DV					
23	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RE	of Records &	Reporting		
24		Chief, Bureau o	of Reporting			
25						
				DOCUMENT NUMBER-	DATE	

05341 MAY-18

APPEARANCES:

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

PAUL B. JOACHIM of Florida Telephone

Services, LLC 696 East Altamonte Suite 4, Altamonte

Springs, Florida 32701 appearing on behalf of

Florida Telephone Services, LLC.

BETH KEATING, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540

Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399,

appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Let's call the hearing to order.

Counsel, read the notice.

MS. KEATING: By notice issued April 3rd, 2000 and revised on April 25th, 2000, this time and place have been set for a prehearing conference in Docket Number 991947-TP. The purpose is as set forth in the notice.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We will take appearances.

MR. EDENFIELD: Kip Edenfield on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

MR. JOACHIM: Paul Joachim on behalf of Florida Telephone Services.

MS. KEATING: And Beth Keating on behalf of Commission staff.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. I understand there are some preliminary matters that we need to address, Counsel. Would you go over those.

MS. KEATING: Yes, Commissioner, actually there are. On March 30th, which was the date for filing rebuttal testimony and prehearing statements, Florida Telephone Services filed direct testimony and a memorandum in support of a motion for summary judgment. I do want to point out that Florida Telephone did not actually file a motion along with that memorandum, they simply filed the

memorandum.

Thereafter, on April 12th, BellSouth filed a motion to strike and a response to the motion for summary judgment, and they asked that Florida Telephone Services' direct testimony be stricken as well as the memorandum in support of its motion for summary judgment.

They also pointed out that Florida Telephone had not filed a timely prehearing statement. And in accordance with the order establishing procedure, failure to file a prehearing statement constitutes a waiver of the party's position on the issues, and a waiver of their right to file testimony.

However, Florida Telephone did file a prehearing statement. That was, however, on April 18th. And we just wanted to bring those to your attention. And I would suggest that you take up the motion to strike first.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Very well. Mr. Edenfield.

MR. EDENFIELD: Thank you, Commissioner Jacobs.

BellSouth filed a motion to strike basically as to two
things that were filed by Florida Telephone Services. One
of which is the direct testimony of Mr. Joachim. The
other is as to what appears to be styled as a motion for
summary judgment.

At this point, I'm not real sure whether Florida

Telephone Services is actually seeking summary judgment in

this case. To the extent that they are, the memorandum that was filed lacks all the fundamental requirements of a motion for summary judgment under Florida law. It does not allege that there are no material issues of fact in dispute. It does not allege that they are entitled to judgment as a matter of law. In fact, what it appears to be is nothing more than direct testimony as to the issue of whether BellSouth is actually entitled to recover OSS costs in this proceeding.

Obviously BellSouth has a different position on that. There is record evidence of BellSouth's position on that. And, in short, Florida Telephone, if they are seeking summary judgment, it should be denied.

We can take these one at a time or I can do as to the direct testimony as well now.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Why don't we do both.

MR. EDENFIELD: Okay. As to the direct testimony, you had entered an order establishing procedure in this docket which required direct testimony to be filed on March the 9th. Obviously, by way of background, Florida Telephone did not file an answer to the petition for arbitration. They did not file the direct testimony timely. They filed what has been styled as direct testimony on the 27th of March, which is some two weeks thereabouts, two weeks thereabouts after the date

established in the order establishing procedure.

Clearly under the order establishing procedure a party is required to file the direct testimony, as all testimony, timely. It is undisputed that they actually did not file it timely, so therefore BellSouth has moved to strike that testimony.

MR. JOACHIM: May I say something, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Joachim?

MR. JOACHIM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm going to allow you to respond in a moment. If you would, just hold your comments, but we will be happy to hear what your response is, though.

MR. EDENFIELD: I understand that they did file the direct testimony, it would be considered timely had it been rebuttal testimony. But the problem with that is the large majority of what they have filed as direct testimony is not in response to anything BellSouth has filed.

The problem at this point is we did not know what their position has been because they never filed a response to the petition. We are just now finding out what their position is. And the date for us to file rebuttal to that testimony passed after -- actually before we received the testimony. So at this point we are left with what appears to be positions taken by Florida

Telephone Services that BellSouth is not able to respond 1 And that is the basis for our motion. 2 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Very good. 3 Mr. Joachim. 4 MR. JOACHIM: Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: It is my understanding 6 that you do not have -- retained counsel representing you? 7 That is correct. And I would like MR. JOACHIM: 8 to respond to some of those comments made by BellSouth, if 9 I may. 10 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That will be fine, 11 but let me first make sure you understand the proceedings 12 13 that we are involved in now. As you are aware, this is essentially an administrative law matter. 14 15 MR. JOACHIM: Uh-huh. 16 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And the issue now is to 17 what extent the procedures that were set out in advance, 18 i.e., the order that established the procedures that we 19 will follow in this case were adhered to. And the essence of BellSouth's allegations is that you haven't adhered to 20 21 those procedures and therefore you forfeited your right to 22 proceed at all.

MR. JOACHIM: That's what they are saying.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Now, why don't you give us your response.

23

24

25

MR. JOACHIM: Yes. You are quite right, I do not have counsel, I am representing myself. We are a small company trying to fight a very large, you know, monolithic company. And I was a little confused about, you know, the terms used in terms of the type of documents submitted. I, in fact, assumed that the documents I submitted were in a timely manner until I was told, look, you need to change the titles and submit the documents in this fashion so that they are properly docketed.

That is why you do find the document adjusted. In fact, the information is very, very similar, if not identical, in the way they were filed. So, although technically, yes, I might have missed a date, but it was supposed to have been filed all by the due date, which was the 30th. I ask that you use that information to make your judgment based on this.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Now, help me understand, the document that you filed that is titled, "Florida Telephone Services memorandum in support of motion for summary judgment," that was the very first document you filed, correct?

MR. JOACHIM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And your intent behind that document, help me understand that. What did you hope to achieve by the filing of this document, what action by

the Commission? 1 MR. JOACHIM: Well, I believe that a counter 2 document sent by Florida Telephone in response to 3 BellSouth's arbitration asked for arbitration as well as 4 seeking (inaudible) --5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me, Mr. Joachim, 6 we have a court reporter here, and she is taking a 7 transcript of this proceeding. So we will have to ask 8 that you speak very close into your -- if you are on a 9 speaker phone, be clear in your --10 MR. JOACHIM: I know we have a problem with this 11 12 line. 13 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes, we will try to work 14 through that. But just speak moderately slow and very 15 close to your speaker, okay? 16 MR. JOACHIM: Okay. You are breaking up right 17 Can we hear me? now. 18 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We can hear you okay. 19 MR. JOACHIM: Okay. Because you are very, very 20 faint. 21 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I will try to get closer 22 to mine. MR. JOACHIM: Go ahead, Commissioner. 23 24 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, so if I can, again, 25 your filing of this memorandum in support was in response

to BellSouth's original petition for arbitration, is that correct?

MR. JOACHIM: That's correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, as I understand it, you did file a statement that you intended to be -- essentially to be the basic statement of your position in this document, and that was labelled as a prehearing statement, is that correct?

MR. JOACHIM: That was the intent, yes.

commissioner Jacobs: Okay. Here is what we will rule. I'm going to grant BellSouth's motion to strike the motion for summary judgement, the memorandum in support of a motion for two reasons: First of all, there really was not a motion, per se, filed. And the memorandum is generally a legal document, sort of a brief, a mini-brief, if you will, in support of a technical motion.

And then, lastly, that document really just gives some of your positions which you have adequately stated in your prehearing statement. I am denying the motion as to the prehearing statement, and I am granting an extension of time until whatever days it was filed after the original due date is proper.

Now, let's move to the testimony that you filed, Mr. Joachim.

MR. JOACHIM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: It is my understanding that that testimony was filed on or about a date where we call rebuttal testimony was due. Do you understand the difference between what rebuttal testimony and what direct testimony is?

MR. JOACHIM: Yes. If I understand it correctly, rebuttal testimony is counteracting what BellSouth has said.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Right. And BellSouth's allegation is that the testimony that you filed essentially was asserting your own positions in the first instance as opposed to responding to theirs.

MR. JOACHIM: That is what BellSouth claims, yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And what would be your response to that?

MR. JOACHIM: Well, I was stating my position as well as trying to counteract it. If it is not clear, I do apologize for that. If there is something else I can do, I will be happy to draw up another document. But this is my position, and I think I was responding to some of their charges. But if that is not clear, then I guess I will have to do something else.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Here is what I'm going to

The major harm to BellSouth is that they don't have 1 do. an opportunity to respond to the things that you put in 2 yours because it came in in a time frame that was not 3 anticipated. I'm going to deny their motion to strike, 4 but because you said that, in essence, encompasses your 5 full statement of your position, I'm going to allow 6 7 BellSouth time to respond to that in writing. Now, the gist of that is that you won't have an opportunity to 8 respond to what BellSouth files, do you understand? 9 10 MR. JOACHIM: Yes. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. But I am going to 11 12 allow them time to respond to what you filed in writing, 13 and the benefit you get of that is that you get -- we will 14 take what you filed as your testimony. We will take it as 15 both -- is that sufficient with you, Mr. Edenfield? 16 MR. EDENFIELD: I understand the ruling. 17 what I will do is if I could have until maybe the close of 18 business Monday to get something filed. 19 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We will give you longer

than that.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. EDENFIELD: I'm not even sure that I'm going to file anything yet, but --

MS. KEATING: Yes, staff was going to recommend maybe May 8th, I think would be --

MR. EDENFIELD: But the hearing is set next

```
1
              MS. KEATING: No, I don't think -- it's not
2
    until the 17th.
3
              MR. EDENFIELD: Somehow I have in my mind that
4
    the hearing is next week. I don't know why I have that in
5
    my mind.
6
              COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I think it is May 17th, as
7
    well.
8
              MR. JOACHIM: The 17th, isn't it, at 9:30 a.m.?
9
              MR. EDENFIELD: I'm sorry. Then May 8th is
10
11
    certainly fine.
              MS. KEATING: Don't scare me like that.
12
              MR. EDENFIELD: I just feel like I got
13
    reprieved.
14
              COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. So that we
15
16
     understand, if that is fine with you, that BellSouth will
17
    have until May 8th to file a response.
18
              Do you understand, Mr. Joachim?
19
              MR. JOACHIM: Yes, I do, and that is quite okay.
20
              COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That takes care of
21
     the motions to strike?
22
              MS. KEATING: (Indicating affirmatively.)
              COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And the confidential, we
23
24
     are going to leave that pending.
25
                             That's correct. Staff will have a
              MS. KEATING:
```

draft order to you, though, prior to the hearing. 1 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Great. Very well. Any 2 other preliminary matters? 3 MS. KEATING: I do have one other thing. 4 would like to revise its position on Issue 1. 5 either take that up now as a preliminary matter or as we 6 are going through the --7 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Why don't we do that when 8 we go through the issues. That would be fine. 9 Nothing else, Mr. Joachim? Preliminary matters 10 being things that haven't been resolved up to this point. 11 1.2 MR. JOACHIM: Yes, sir. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So with all of those being 13 resolved now, we will move to what we normally do at the 14 15 prehearing conference, and essentially that is to walk through this document that is called a prehearing order 16 17 and make sure that there are no corrections from what has 18 been previously documented here. MR. JOACHIM: 19 Yes. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Do you have a copy of that? 21 22 MR. JOACHIM: I do. 23 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay, great. We will just 24 do that now. 25 MR. JOACHIM: This is the revised draft

prehearing order, correct? 1 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Correct. What we will do 2 is go section-by-section. And no revisions to 3 appearances, I assume? 4 MR. EDENFIELD: None from BellSouth. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Section I, Conduct 6 of Proceedings. That is pretty much boilerplate. We will 7 move to Section II, Case Background. Any revisions? 8 Hearing none, we will go to Section III, Procedure for 9 Handling Confidential Information. Again, that is pretty 10 much boilerplate information. 11 MR. EDENFIELD: And, I'm sorry, Commissioner 12 Jacobs, we are going to take up the request for 13 confidential classification at a different time? 14 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We are going to rule on it 15 16 by order, right? MS. KEATING: That's correct. We plan on 17 18 preparing a draft order prior to the hearing. 19 MR. EDENFIELD: Thank you. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Section IV, post-hearing 20 21 procedures. Standard language, as well. As is Section V, prefiled testimony and exhibits and witnesses procedures. 22 That takes us to Section VI, order of 23 Okay. witnesses. Any revisions to this? 24 MR. EDENFIELD: The only potential revision, 25

Commissioner Jacobs, will be if BellSouth decides to file, I quess what would be styled as rebuttal testimony on the 2 8th of May, that would have to be added in here. More 3 than likely it would only be from Witness Varner. I don't see anything in what Mr. Joachim filed that would need 5 rebuttal from Ms. Caldwell. 6 7 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Very well. Do you want to wait until the 8th, then, to 8 issue this? That is fine with me. 9 MS. KEATING: I can either do that or I can 10 place a notation in it to indicate --11 MR. EDENFIELD: Either one works for me. I will 12 probably know by Friday whether I'm going to file 13 anything. If you want to wait, I will just let you know, 14 but anyway you want to handle it is fine. 15 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Great. Next, Section VII, 16 basic positions. Any revisions to the basic position 17 here? Mr. Joachim, any revisions to your basic position? 18 MR. JOACHIM: No, there isn't. 19 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That takes us then to 20 Issue 2. 21 MR. JOACHIM: I'm sorry, is this where the staff 22 23 makes their change? COMMISSIONER JACOBS: In Issue 1. I'm sorry. 24 Let me strike what I just said. We are moving to Section 25

VII, issues and positions, and let's consider Issue 1, any revisions there?

MS. KEATING: Staff would like to revise its

position on this issue. Previously we had taken no

position. However, we would like to change our position

as follows. Staff believes that this issue is not

appropriate for resolution in an arbitration proceeding.

Instead, staff believes that this issue should be resolved

in a generic proceeding after third-party testing of

BellSouth's Operational Support Systems is completed in

Dockets Numbers 981834-TP, and 960786-TL.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Now, that takes care of Issue 1, if there are no other revisions, and that is all the issues. Mr. Joachim.

MR. JOACHIM: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I wanted to make sure -- I know that staff has spoken with you in advance of the prehearing, and you understood that they were changing their position, is that correct?

MR. JOACHIM: She advised me of that, yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Now, you understand -- you have full rights to proceed as you would like, but you understand that their position has some important implications as to the recommendation the Commission will take on and vote on.

MR. JOACHIM: Uh-huh. 1 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Very well. So that takes 2 us to Section IX, which is the exhibit list. And I see 3 only one here. You don't have any exhibits that you are 4 offering, Mr. Joachim? 5 MR. JOACHIM: No, I don't. 6 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Any changes? 7 MR. EDENFIELD: Again, only to the extent one 8 may be required for rebuttal. But, again, I'm not 9 anticipating one. But I would like it reserve that just 10 in case I feel like I need one. 11 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. 12 MR. EDENFIELD: That would also be part of the 13 May 8th filing, so everybody will know in advance. 14 15 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Good. Next is 16 Section X, proposed stipulation, that continues to be 17 none, I assume? And then Section XI, pending motions, we 18 dealt with the motions to strike, and the confidentiality. 19 Section XII we will deal with in an order. 20 The ruling sections will be amended, Mr. 21 Joachim, to reflect what we have done today. 22 MR. JOACHIM: Uh-huh. Can I ask you a question, Commissioner? 23 24 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes. 25 MR. JOACHIM: You had indicated the impact of

staff's position. Do you care to enlighten on that comment that you made? I mean, as to what extent?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Here is what I want to make sure you understand. Staff -- when the Commission, and I think in this instance there is a panel that will actually preside at the hearing and take the evidence at the hearing. And then once that evidence is all taken in, the staff reviews it, and then will ultimately make a recommendation.

Without having the benefit of that evidence, this is staff's preliminary review on what they will recommend to the Commission. So then what might happen is the evidence might be presented at the hearing that in some way, form, or fashion might change. However, in this instance, this is a pretty basic policy position.

And without prejudging this case it would appear unlikely that evidence presented at this hearing would cause staff to modify and so essentially what that means is that staff would recommend after the hearing that we defer a ruling in your case, i.e., in this particular arbitration case, until we resolve issues in two other dockets that we have outstanding.

MR. JOACHIM: I see.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Those two other dockets are generic proceedings where we are looking at all

companies out there dealing with any ILEC, including 1 BellSouth. We are looking at policy that should be 2 implemented with regard to OSS. What OSS interfaces there 3 should be, what requirements there should be, and 4 ultimately what the cost should be that the company should 5 charge to other companies for those OSS provisions. 6 MR. JOACHIM: So, in other words, there could be 7 no resolution in the foreseeable couple of months? 8 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I don't know exactly what 9 10

the timeline of those other two documents are, but I think after two months is probably a reasonable guess.

> MR. JOACHIM: I see. Okay.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Do you understand?

MR. JOACHIM: Yes, sir.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That is what I wanted to make sure of. Now, again, you have the right to proceed as you would like.

MR. JOACHIM: Well, in that case, can I ask you -- I mean, if we are not going to go anywhere with this proceeding other than to defer a ruling, isn't it better to just postpone this until after the dockets have been settled?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's up to you. wouldn't want to give you my recommendation, but I would think that you could consider that.

MR. JOACHIM: Okay. How would I go about doing that? Do I make a motion at this stage?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Why don't I have you talk with our staff counsel, and she can fill you in on all the details that you -- if you want to do it now that is fine with me or you can do it after.

MS. KEATING: I was just going to point out, that, you know, even though this may be staff's preliminary position, it may even be our post-hearing position, that doesn't necessarily mean that the Commission will accept it. The Commission doesn't have to, or the panel doesn't have to approve staff's recommendation.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I did neglect to emphasize that point, I'm sorry. Even though this might be staff's recommendation, Mr. Joachim, there may be a Commissioner who feels like -- it would have to be a majority of the Commissioners sitting on this panel, may indeed determine that they want to make a decision in your case. And so you need to understand that that prospect does exist.

MR. JOACHIM: Okay. I understand.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Why don't you take some time to think about it. And if you would like to do that, you have time. The hearing is not scheduled until May 17th. Take some time and give some thought to it. And

our staff counsel will be happy to chat with you about 1 what your options would be. 2 MS. KEATING: May I also suggest one other 3 thing, Commissioner. That he discuss this, as well, with 4 counsel for BellSouth, because this is, actually 5 BellSouth's --6 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry, I was thinking 7 that you had filed it. I'm sorry, it would be BellSouth 8 whose option it is as to whether or not we go forward on 9 this in terms of whether or not they want to pursue their 10 petition. So why don't you discuss what your desires 11 would be once you come to that conclusion with counsel for 12 13 BellSouth. 14 MR. JOACHIM: Okay. 15 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Anything else we can do 16 today? Do you understand everything we have done? 17 MR. JOACHIM: Yes, I believe I do, sir. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Anything else to 18 come before us today, Counsel? 19 MS. KEATING: None that I'm aware of. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Edenfield? 21 MR. EDENFIELD: Nothing from BellSouth. 22 23 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Hearing none, then, 24 this prehearing is adjourned. 25 MS. KEATING: Thank you.

I		23
1	MR. EDENFIELD: Thank you.	
2	MR. JOACHIM: Thank you, Commissioner.	
3	(The prehearing conference concluded at	
4	11:05 a.m.)	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)						
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER						
3	COUNTY OF LEON)						
4	The state of the s						
5	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, FPSC Bureau of Reporting FPSC Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that						
6	the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 991947-TP was heard by the Prehearing Officer at the time and place						
7	herein stated.						
8	It is further certified that I stenographically						
9	reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 23 pages, constitutes a true						
10	transcript, consisting of 23 pages, constitutes a title transcription of my notes of said proceedings.						
11	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor						
12	am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneyS or counsel connected with the action, nor am I						
13	financially interested in the action.						
14	DATED THIS FIRST DAY OF MAY, 2000.						
15							
16	JANE FAUROT, RPR						
17	FPSC Division of Records & Reporting Chief Bureau of Reporting						
18	(850) 413-6732						
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							