1	HI OD	BEFORE THE	
2	FLORI	DA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3		:	
4	In the Mat	ter of : DOCKET NO. 990649-TP	
5	INVESTIGATION INTUNBUNDLED NETWORK		
6			
7			
8	*****	*******	
9	*		
	* ARE A	RONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT *	
10		FFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING * O NOT INCLUDE PREFILED TESTIMONY. *	
11	* ******	* *********	
12			
13	PROCEEDINGS:	DRAL ARGUMENT	
14	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER E. LEON JACOBS, JR.	
15	 	Prehearing Officer	
16	D.3.000		
17	DATE:	Friday, June 2, 2000	
18	TIME:	Commenced at 1:30 p.m.	
19	(Concluded at 2:23 p.m.	
20		Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
21	4	1075 Esplanade Way Fallahassee, Florida	
22			
		TRICIA DEMARTE	
23		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6736	
24			
25		003872	
	FLORI	DA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DOCUMENT NUMBER-DA	
25	FLORI	BOCHMENT NUMBER OF	

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

06954 JUN-88

APPEARANCES:

MARSHA RULE, 106 East College Avenue, Suite 1410, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

DONNA McNULTY, MCI WorldCom, 325 John Knox Road, Tallahassee, Florida 32303, appearing on behalf of MCI WorldCom.

RICHARD MELSON, Hopping, Boyd, Green & Sams, 123 South Calhoun Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of MCI WorldCom and Rhythms Links.

JOSEPH McGLOTHLIN, McWhirter Law Offices, 117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of FCCA.

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

KIMBERLY CASWELL, GTE Florida Incorporated, P. O. Box 110, FLTC0007, Tampa, Florida 33601-0110, appearing on behalf of GTE Florida Incorporated.

JEFFRY WAHLEN, Ausley & McMullen, 227 South Calhoun Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of ALLTEL.

1 APPEARANCES (Continued):

CHARLES REHWINKEL, P. O. Box 2214, Tallahassee, Florida 32316-2214, appearing on behalf of Sprint-Florida, Incorporated.

DIANA CALDWELL and WAYNE KNIGHT, FPSC Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

ALSO PRESENT:

WALTER D'HAESELEER PAT LEE

1	PROCEEDINGS		
2	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We'll call this proceeding		
3	to order. Counsel, would you read the notice.		
4	MS. CALDWELL: Yes. The notice was issued on		
5	May 26, 2000, in Docket Number 990649-TP in regard to		
6	investigation into pricing of unbundled network elements		
7	that an emergency oral argument would be heard at this		
8	time and place.		
9	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Take appearances.		
10	MS. RULE: Marsha Rule for AT&T.		
11	MS. McNULTY: Donna McNulty, MCI WorldCom.		
12	MR. MELSON: Rick Melson, MCI WorldCom and		
13	Rhythms Links.		
14	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Joe McGlothlin, FCCA.		
15	MR. ROSS: Bennett Ross on behalf of BellSouth		
16	Telecommunications.		
17	MS. CASWELL: Kim Caswell, GTE Florida.		
18	MR. WAHLEN: Jeff Wahlen on behalf of ALLTEL.		
19	And Charles Rehwinkel is here		
20	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I saw him. Otherwise		
21	MR. WAHLEN: for Sprint. He'll be right		
22	here.		
23	MS. CALDWELL: Diana Caldwell and Wayne Knight		
24	for Public Service Commission Staff.		
25	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Counsel, would you explain		
	ELODIDA DUBLIC CEDVICE COMMISSION		

how we're going to proceed here.

MS. CALDWELL: Well, I think that the -- we would -- have the parties reached an agreement? What we have done is that all the parties have gotten together, and they have -- what we have discussed is a potential revision to dates of hearing dates and due dates for testimony. However, I do not believe all parties are on board, and so we want to explore that just a little bit further.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Who would like to lead out?

MS. CASWELL: I can --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MS. CASWELL: -- Commissioner Jacobs, because

GTE has opposed both motions, both the motion for

extension of testimony and for the continuance of the

hearing. GTE had nothing to do with the problems that

purportedly lead the ALECs to file the motions, and so GTE

is dismayed at being prejudice by the relief suggest by

the ALECs.

We are particularly concerned with having any relief that would cut down the period we have for filing rebuttal testimony to the ALECs' direct case. There is no reason why the ALECs could not have filed their direct case on June 1st. Instead, they have not filed anything

at this point, direct or rebuttal.

That said, I -- we have tried to come to some compromise with the other parties on potentially moving most of the hearings to September, keeping perhaps a couple of issues in July, and not curtailing GTE's time to do rebuttal on the issues for July, and also requiring the ALECs to adhere to a two-week turnaround for discovery and a five-day objection period for discovery so that their time for discovery would be shortened a little bit, and we would have had some opportunity to do discovery before the hearings.

Again, this is just a tentative agreement. I've had a half an hour to try and contact my people and see if they will change their positions on the motions. I have not been able to get to the people I need to. I think the solution will be acceptable, but again, I can't give a definitive answer today. I think the compromise will be acceptable, though.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Can we -- can someone just kind of cover what the basic content of the agreement is?

MR. ROSS: Commissioner Jacobs, Bennett Ross on behalf of BellSouth. The general framework of the resolution of this issue would be basically to switch around the existing hearing dates. Right now, we have

hearings in July that were supposed to deal mostly with the bulk of the cost studies, all of BellSouth's cost studies and most of GTE's. We had three days in September that were set aside to deal with some other cost studies being submitted by GTE.

The general framework of the proposal really would involve shifting the vast majority of the issues to September, trying to come up with three additional hearing dates in September, all of which would lead up to a decision by the Commission no later than February of 2001. We understand that there are some scheduling issues in September, but we believe that if the Commission can come up with three additional dates -- and the dates that we had looked at were the 13th through the 15th of September, in addition to the existing dates that are already on the calendar, which are the 20th through the 22nd -- we believe this resolution will work.

And basically, what it would involve is that the parties would agree to resolve -- or to hear testimony on issues consisting of depreciation, cost of capital, and taxes in July at the July hearing. And we've agreed to dates for the filing of testimony by the ALECs and rebuttal by the ILECs for those issues as well as counsel mentioned for discovery.

All the other issues that are currently on the

table would be deferred until September, and we've also reached agreement on the time frames for the filing of the ALEC testimony and ILEC rebuttal testimony on the remaining issues.

I believe right now the big question is whether or not we can get -- whether the Commission can find the additional three days in September which would allow this all to fall into place.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Since it's AT&T's motion,

I would be interested in your thoughts about it.

MS. RULE: Well, I think we've kind of moved beyond arguing the motion to what we're going to do, Commissioner. I would like to point out that this case, setting the costs for UNE rates, is arguably the most important thing the Commission can do this year to move forward competition in Florida.

And as we explored at great length this morning in the workshop, we find ourselves in a position where we have not been able to make BellSouth's model run in order to generate the results that we can then write testimony on. And I don't want to belabor the very fruitful time we spent this morning trying to, you know, work out where to go next. And we are not attempting to point fingers at BellSouth. Nobody alleges that they had -- were doing anything other than trying to be helpful to us, but all of

us, including Staff, find ourselves in the position of being basically a month behind schedule. And the schedule was rather ambitious to begin with.

I think the Commission's interests are best served and certainly our interests as a competitive community are well served by continuing this hearing to a time where we can prepare testimony that will help the Commission decide these important issues.

commissioner Jacobs: Under the original schedule -- and maybe Staff or any of the parties could help me out on this -- we were going to come forward with some proposed prices for UNEs that would be available as of -- when? Do you recall?

MS. CALDWELL: We had a special agenda for the bulk of the issues on October the 16th with a standard order coming out November the 16th.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. So ostensibly that would have been UNEs prices available. And now we're saying probably February of 2000?

MS. CALDWELL: Yes. If we -- we were looking at a special agenda date on February the 19th. So we would be looking at probably the very first of March for the order to come out.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That, in my mind, is the -- is where the rubber meets the road here, I

think. My concern is that we not defer very long at all on the availability of UNEs at the prices that have come out of a reasonable deliberative process. My preference was that we would take care of most of the issues early rather than later. Let me just hear about this, I guess, from the parties. It was my understanding that the difficulties related to a model that had principally to do with the cost of the loop and that the other issues were not necessarily caught up in that; is that correct?

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Jacobs, Rick Melson.

I think the loop model has been the most troublesome. As a practical matter that is a key to a great number of UNEs. And frankly, the parties attempting to work with that model and to get it to work have been so focussed on that and moving forward with that very important part of the case that other things that normally would have been going on at the same time have been pushed to the back burner.

I think Rhythms and MCI WorldCom were both very anxious to have UNE prices in effect this year. Rhythms, I think, now feels that the compromised schedule is -- while we're not happy with it, it's needed because we don't think that we're going to be able to do the job to put together the case we need to put together if the bulk of these issues go to hearing in July.

And I think WorldCom's position is somewhat similar, although they, I think, have been most anxious to get things done this year. But I think the compromise is probably the best we can do, and as Ms. Rule said enables the Commission to get the information to make the best informed decision on rates that are probably going to then be in effect for, you know, two to three years.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Any other parties want to have any comments? Staff?

MS. CALDWELL: If I could have just a moment to confer with Staff over here.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MS. CALDWELL: Commissioner, Staff supports the settlement or the proposal that the parties have come up with. The concern that Staff has with the -- that they had had when this -- when the motion for continuance and the postponement of time, when those motions were filed is that the times that were being proposed was not giving Staff adequate time for us to look at the models.

And as we went through this morning, companies were explaining the different problems that they have had.

We, I think, have been able to run one of the cost models, but what we were determining this morning was the amount of time that Staff would need in order to come up with its own recommendation.

1 Ω

And it was also Staff's -- would be Staff's position that the February 19th special agenda date was very important to Staff for us to be able to run the models themselves as well as do different simulations and testing with that. And we felt it was very important for -- in order for Staff to have its input into this process that we also be given adequate time.

And it's a very -- as everybody has indicated, it's a very complex model, and Staff also wants the opportunity to be able to have its input and its time with the model with the testimony and the discovery. And that's why we had proposed the February 19th special agenda date.

We also had done some rough calculations that the recommendation itself was going to run about 2,100 pages. That was a rough estimate. It did not include a table of contents; it didn't include case background. We have 63 issues -- 68 issues times three companies. So in order for Staff to do its best job, we felt like the February 19th date was the best we could do.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. The first thing that jumps out at me is, I'm happy that there has been the effort to go to work on this and to resolve the issues. The second thing that jumps out at me is that this reeks of the type of complexity that can have a life of its own

and that we've seen in other dockets in other proceedings which would absolutely be unacceptable on these issues.

We could not allow the uncertainty that presently exists to go item for item. We need to bring these issues to closure. And so what I'd like to do is, I'm not going to rule today. I've heard the issues.

We're going to do an order very quickly to resolve the motion. But what I'd like -- particularly given the comments of Ms. Caswell, and I'm sure the others probably have the same concern, I'd like you to go back to your principals, and let's really get this nailed down. Let's be fairly clear that what we say we can do, we can really do.

And if there are any questions about that -- and reasonably enough, you can never be prophetic, but I'd like to make sure we get these issues out in front. And if there is a particular difficulty that we need to address with regard to the model, then let's get some main frame computer expert somewhere -- somebody used to make main frame computers. AT&T, did you all make those? I thought it was particularly ironic in this episode. But anyway, let's find a computer guru somewhere and get them fixed.

MS. RULE: Commissioner, I think as we heard this morning, it's not really a computer problem.

BellSouth has proposed a model that is massive and complex and we believe overall a good model, but like all new models, and particularly one as massive and complex as BellSouth's, it just takes time to work out. And some of the problems were, once discovered, fairly easy to fix, and that's why I think we're able to work and move forward and on an amicable basis.

I would also like to let you know that assuming that we can continue to work with BellSouth in this way, AT&T does not propose to put on its own model, and that would further shorten the case. So we think in this case at least the continuance would help to simplify the issues at the end.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Walter?

MR. D'HAESELEER: Commissioner, it needs to be clear where we're coming from, the Staff's position. And that is, if all the parties want us to do a thorough and complete job on the tail end after we have heard the testimony and the record is developed, we're just going to need some time. And if we don't get the time, somebody is going to be disappointed in the end product. And this is one of the most important cases we're going to have this year, so it has to be done right. And, therefore, Staff, really, we need the time. And we're not trying to cry or anything else. We're just telling you the facts the way

they are.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Do you anticipate given -once we -- you understand the proposal now. Do you
anticipate that it would not give you the time that you
need?

MR. D'HAESELEER: The schedule that we're talking about is a February recommendation to the Commission, and I'm telling you that's what really we need to do a thorough and complete job because it is so complex. It's not a simple matter.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, that includes a decision and a special conference then in February, right?

MR. D'HAESELEER: Right.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Right.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: You can go ahead, and then
Mr. Melson after you.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I think it might be a good time just to stress the amount of give and take that has gone into this potential workout. I think that the parties understand very well Staff's situation and try to respond to that by, first of all, agreeing to carve out those issues that could be addressed in the July hearing to reduce the size of the tasks that results from combining

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Someone else --

the others with the September work to be done.

And also, it was a priority of some of the intervenors to try to get the results before the calendar year is over, and there was some give on that so that the Staff's needs were a manageable task in September and the time needed to give us a recommendation were addressed.

Also, GTE had some concerns about the impact on GTE's discovery ability if we were to go forward in July, and a way was found to agree to some expedited turnarounds on discovery there. So I think this potential solution is a result of a very real compromise by numerous parties, and the only missing ingredient that we can see at this point absent Ms. Caswell's need to get final clearance would be to find the hearing dates in September.

And so I think those of us here at the table respectfully urge the Prehearing Officer to see if that can be managed as the way to address the very real problems that have arisen in this case.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Mr. Melson?

MR. MELSON: Commission Jacobs, you mentioned a main frame. What I learned this morning in sitting through the technical workshop is that to run a complete scenario through the BellSouth cost model takes about 30 hours or three to four workdays. To run a sensitivity completely through takes about a day. And so one

reason -- I think when the schedule was originally developed, nobody understood the potential complexity of this model and the amount of time it was going to take to run even on a very fast computer. And faced with the reality of what it takes, we've tried to compromise on a schedule that gets the information to you as quickly as we can.

MS. RULE: Commissioner, this is Marsha Rule.

If I was unclear, I apologize. The compromise includes
the Staff's time. Nobody is arguing that Staff should be
backing their time up to make a decision earlier than
February. We recognize that the very same complexity that
causes us to need more time causes Staff to need plenty of
time to make a decision and a recommendation.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: It sounds like the schedule needs a drop-dead date for you guys. In terms of the hearing, there needs to be a date certain in order for you to come up with an analysis by February the 19th. Did I hear you saying that?

MR. D'HAESELEER: No, it would be more than that. We would have our recommendation; then we would have the special agenda sometime in February.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Right, but I'm saying what I hear you saying is that you -- in order to be ready in February, there is some lead time that is absolute for

you.

MR. D'HAESELEER: Right. And we agree with the September hearings.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MR. D'HAESELEER: And if those are held in September, that would -- and then we have until February or pretty close to it, that will give us the lead time we need.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MS. CALDWELL: Commissioner, we have built those times in already.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Very well. Okay. As I indicated, we'll be doing an order very quickly. Again, to the extent that you have -- that there's any questions or concerns that may arise, please bring those to the attention of Staff as soon as possible. And if need be, we'll have a conference call to resolve those, but we'll come up with an order that has dates. Should that be the case, they are going to be pretty hard and fast.

MS. CASWELL: Yes. Commissioner Jacobs, I would just like until perhaps the end of Monday to get back with Staff as to whether the proposal is acceptable to GTE. I just want to avoid having an order be issued before we've come to agreement within the company on whether this is

okay.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I don't think it would be before Monday.

MS. CASWELL: Okay.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Commissioner, in our huddle we developed a complete time frame, including the testimony dates that would be acceptable to the group in the event that September dates are found. Would you like for the group to submit on a piece of paper what the entire outline would be?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: If that helps to Staff. I don't need to, but if you guys want to have that formally committed, then that's fine with me. What I hear is that we're looking for at least, what is it, six days in September?

MR. D'HAESELEER: Commissioner, could we call about a five-minute break and let us talk to you a minute?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. We'll recess for five minutes.

(Brief recess.)

commissioners Jacobs: Suffice it to say that the effort to find Commissioners' time is as difficult as resolving this docket. So we've not confirmed that the 13th through the 15th would be available. It looks like we won't be able to get those dates. I'm, however, very

hopeful that we can get two other dates, and my preference would be the 11th and the 12th of September. We have one Commissioner presently who we need to confirm with that, but right now, we're going to shoot for the 11th and the 12th, and the 20th through the 22nd.

Now, that's going to -- that for this docket is going to be very tight. We're going to be here late every night. You can expect that. Unless, of course, you guys will have made significant headway by that time.

So for the moment let's proceed with those dates. Again, the 11th and the 12th being tentative dates for the moment. Everything else, however, I'd like for you to get back with Staff by the first of next week to confirm the proposed schedule that you have in place now for the preliminary up to the hearing. Great. Is there anything else that we need to --

MS. CALDWELL: Commissioner, I think that the intent then is that we not hold the depreciation, cost of capital, and taxes. All of that, too, would be rolled into the September time frame --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: No, no, no, no. No, I think we still schedule those for July. I thought that was -- that was my intent, that we still carry that forward for July. I mean, it's going to be tight enough as it is.

MR. ROSS: I think that was the proposal for the -- the industry felt that that was the best way to do it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, here's the thing,
Staff is going to have a problem getting enough time to do
the analysis on this. I can't imagine that on that
testimony that we couldn't afford some flexibility to
them. And when I say that, I mean that the industry could
get their input in as quickly as possible and perhaps even
advance the schedule now that we know what the issues will
be.

If you can look at this time line and advance it in any way possible so that we can give Staff some flexibility on the back end to do the analysis that it needs, I would highly, highly recommend that.

MR. ROSS: Commissioner Jacobs, just one question. I don't think that -- I'm not sure what the Staff issue is. We were not necessarily envisioning a separate Staff rec on cost of capital, depreciation. We just thought we would get the testimony in, get that part of the hearing done, and if the Staff wants to do one rec at the end of all the proceedings, that was fine with us, I believe.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I think primarily this is to prepare cross. Or is it in anticipation -- has

Staff -- let me ask first one question. Are you anticipating doing a separate recommendation for these issues that we'll hear in July?

MS. LEE: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. So this is primarily a matter of preparing your cross-examination for hearing, the time to prepare that.

MS. LEE: Yes.

1.5

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Commissioner Jacobs, there are currently five days set aside. If you assume that those issues are unlikely to take more than two days and you took the last days that week, that would give at least a few additional days of the first part of that week for people to finalize their cross and so forth.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I think that will work, but again, I think as much flexibility as early would be better.

MR. ROSS: The schedule we propose only pushes the deadline by one week. So it should -- the testimony is supposed to be filed on the 1st, and now it's going to, under our proposal, be filed on the 8th. So I think Staff should -- hopefully will be able to work with that.

MS. CASWELL: Commissioner, just one thing I'd like to point out. If Staff would prefer to move

everything to September and not have any issues heard in July, we would be amenable to that solution, GTE. I think the other parties would oppose it, but if that's Staff's preference, we're willing to go with that as well. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm not. MS. CALDWELL: Our preference --COMMISSIONER JACOBS: The only --MS. CALDWELL: Commissioner? COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry. Who was that I 10 was hearing? I'm sorry. Diana Caldwell. 11 MS. CALDWELL: 12 think it's Staff's -- Staff would just as soon have the depreciation, cost of capital, and taxes, we could go with 13 that also being heard in the September time frame. 14 15 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I understand. MS. CALDWELL: We don't have a problem with 16 17 that. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I understand; however, I'm 18 19 not prepared to do that. And the reason I am is that I'm hearing there are 68 issues across these companies that 20 21 are to be heard. Unless I begin to see some stipulation 22 on some issues, I'm not putting off anything that we have the time to do now. 23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

were some issues that would begin to fall out, but given

Now, that would give me some comfort if there

that we have to address the complexity of the discussion that we have to deal with across that number of issues, we have to dig in now. I would prefer to have more, but given that we are where we are, we'll proceed.

And what I would -- well, let me ask this of Staff. Get with the parties and get clear about what the schedule proposes for the July hearing, and then if you need more flexibility, let's talk about that and see what we can do about that. But I will be highly uncomfortable with pushing all of these issues off in what looks like now would probably only be a five-day hearing.

MR. D'HAESELEER: Commissioner, maybe the Staff needs to talk in view of this direction if there are additional issues that can be identified and taken care of or disposed of or whatever in the July time frame rather than September. I know they had some discussion this morning, but they didn't have your viewpoint.

Now, in view of the direction that you want to take, maybe we need to sit down with the parties and see if there are additional issues that we can hear in the time frame. Maybe if you gave us a half hour? Or do you --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'd -- let me take this approach. We're going to do an order on Monday, right? Why don't you just take the whole weekend? Sit on it,

give that some thought. I'll review the order that you come up with, the proposed order that Staff comes up with, and then we'll go from there. The resolution of this should be whatever -- how you want to resolve this should be clearly stated in that order resolving the continuance. Is that adequate? MR. D'HAESELEER: That will do. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. I would think that sitting around today that we already know their concerns about, you know, what we've talked about today. Let's kind of -- let's give it some time, and give it some

Anyone else? Very well. If there's nothing else, then this proceeding is adjourned. Thank you.

clarity and thought, and then we'll go from there.

(Oral argument concluded at 2:23 p.m.)

STATE OF FLORIDA) 1 2 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 3 COUNTY OF LEON 4 I, TRICIA DEMARTE, Official FPSC Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the hearing in Docket No. 990649-TP 5 was heard by Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, Jr., Prehearing 6 Officer at the time and place herein stated. 7 It is further certified that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this 8 transcript, consisting of 25 pages, constitutes a true 9 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, 10 attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a 11 relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially 12 interested in the action. 13 DATED this 8th day of June, 2000. 14 Fricia De Marte 15 16 FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6736 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25