## BEFORE THE

 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COME SSION

## APPEARANCES:

MARTHA CARTER BROWH and CATHERTME BEDELK., Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard 0 : Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0863, on behalf of the Comission staff.

JOBMPH A. MogLOTHLIM, MoWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davilson \& Bakas, 315 South Calhoun Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of the Florida Competitive Carriers Assoaietion.

Mark LOGM, Bryant, Miller olive, P.A., 201 South Monroe street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301,


RICHARD MELsOA, Hopping Green Sams and Smith, Post Office Box 6526, Tallahassee, FLorida 32314, appearing on behalf of MCI Motrc Acoess Transaission Services, Inc.

JOHP R. ELLIs, Rutledge, Ecenia, Underwood, Purnell \& Hoffman, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Teloport Communcations Group, Inc. and TCG, south Florida.

GARY EARLY, Akerman, Senterfitt \& Edison, P.A. 21, South Monroe Street, Suite 200, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing for Bollsouth BSE.purpose of the prehearing conference is set out in the notice.

COMGISEIONER DEABOM: Thank you. Take appearances.

MR. EARLY: Gary Early -epresenting BellSouth BSE, Inc., firm of Akerman, Senterfitt and Edison.

MR. MELSON: Richard Melison of Hopping Green Sams \& Smith on behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc.

Mr. Mogyothmily Joe McGlothlin on behalf of the Florida Competitive Carriers Association.

20R. LOCN: Mark Logan, Bryant, Miller 4 Olive, on behalf of ATAT Comunications of the

Southern States, Inc., and I'd also like to enter an appearance for Marsha Rule of AT\&T.

3R. ELLIS: John Ellis with Rutlvdge, Ecenia, Underwood, Purnell \& Hoffman for Teleport Communications Group and TCG South Florida.

MB. BROWil: Martha Carter Brown and
Catherine Bedell on behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission.

Comocrssiontar peason: Mr. Ellis; is that
correct?
MR. BLLIB: Yes, six.
COMATEBIOARER DEASOM: E-L-L-I-S?
MR. ELLIS: Yes.
comprssioner peasox; And, Mr. Early; is that correct?

MR. EARLY: Yes, Commistioner.
Comotrssioniz deasont Any preliminary matters?

MB. BROWI: There are n) preliminary matters that Staff is aware of, Commissioner Deason.

COMOISSIONER DEASOM: Do any parties have any preliminary matters? (No response.)

Very well. Then we will proceed in reviewing the draft prehearing order. For the ease of my own review, I'm going to be working from perhaps a
draft that is a day or two earlier $k$ cause I have notes written on that, but it is substantially the same draft, I think, that all the parties have at this point.

First of all, let me ask, is there anyone here from Time Warner? (No response.)

MB. Brownt I don't think so, Commissioner Deason.

COMAISEIONER DEABON: Is Time Warner a party?

MB. BROMA: They petitioned to intervene and were granted intervention. I will call them as soon as the prehearing conference is over and see what the story is. They didn't file a prehearing statement.

COMDISEIOMER DEAsont: Okiy. But they do have party status at this point?

Ms. BROMI: Yes. The Coumission voted last Tuesday to grant them party status.

COMOLESIOMER DEABOM: All right. We will review the draft prehearing order beginning with Case Background. Any questions or changes? (No response.)

Very well. Section 2, Procedure for Hendling Confidential Information. That's fairly standard. (No response.)

Section 3, Prafiled Testimony and Exhibits.
(No response.)
Section 4, Order of Witnesses. (No response.)

Section 5, Basic Positions. (No response.)
Section 6, Issues and Positions:
Issue No. 1. All parties are in agreement with the wording of this issue; is that correct?

MR. EAREY: Gary Early for BellSouth BSE. I just wanted to make sure - and we have agreed to the basic structure of the issues as presented here, but in the conference that we had in which these issues were put together, I just wanted to make sure that our position -- the issues say it's in light of the provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. And when this issue was put together we wanted to make sure that our position -- that the 'elecommunications Act of 1996 does not directly affect the granting of an ALEC certificate in this proceeding.

It remains our position that the granting or denial of an ALEC certification in Florida is governed solely by 364.337 . This was put in, as I recall, as kind of an overriding restatement of the law. But it $s$ our position that the elements of the Telecommunications Act that deal with anticompetitive behavior and that type of thing are not relevant to
the granting of a certificate, although they may be relevant sometime after if there are allegations of anticompetitive behavior.
conocrsayomer deabom: Well, I had a discussion with staff this morning about this very thing, and the partiss agreed to the wording of the issue; bet your position may perhaps need to be clarified. Are you suggesting that you need to change your position with this new wording?
mr. eardy: Well, at this point I don't want to change the language of the issue pecause it was agreed to in our meeting, but I think --
comarisioner peason: I'm talking about the language of your position in response to the issue.
mR. early: I think our position accurately sets forth what our position is, is that it's determined by 364.337 .

COMIBsIONBR DEAsON: Do the parties wish to address the inclusion of that terminulogy concerning the federal act?

My concern is this, and I've discussed this with Staff: If the parties agree with this wording, fine, we can address it. That's not to be in any way interpreted that bj accepting this issue the Commission agrees that the federal act has anything to
do with certification.
In fact, we can resolve it and .t may be that -- I don't know what the Comission's decision is going to be, but it may be that we just decide that according to 364 , either a certificate is granted or is not, and silent, or even perhaps say the Telecommunications Act has nothing to do with state certification.

MR. MELsOM: And, Commissioner Deason, that's consistent with the discussion the parties had. We, MCI, does believe that there are provisions of the Telecommunications Act that apply, but we did not intend by including that in tive issue to prejudge the decision the Commission ultimatel: makes.

Obviously BSE is free to argue as they do that it has no application at all, and I think that's all fair game. At least it was my understanding that that would all be fair game under tils issue.

COMDIBEIOMER DEABOM: Very well. And all that can be fully explored within this wording.

MR. EARLY: Yeah, I think that's accurate. We kepi it as an issue because the parties other than BellSouth BSE thought chat it should be considered, but we just wanted to make sure that when that language went in that it wasn't construed as an
admission by BellSouth BSE that that was -- that we were acquiescing to those types of consider tions.

COMAKSEIOMER DEASOM: The parties may need to think about which court -- if there's an appeal as a result of a decision in this case, which court does it go to. If you say that both acts apply and you can't do it one without the other, do you file simultaneous appeals in state and federal court? I mean, you may want to think about it. I don't know the answer to that, but it's just one thing I was thinking about when I was reviewing it.

Any changes to tha positions in response to
Issue 1? (No response.)
Okay. Issue 2.
26. BROMnt Commissicner Deason, you pointed out to me that FCCA, ATET, and MCI in the way we had recorded their position, the las', line of their position prescribed "whole disccunts". I think it should be "wholesale," and I jus: wanted to point out if there are any other little typos or scrivener's errors that the partiss see, they can let me know and I'11 fix it.

COMAISSIONSR DצAson: Yes. I believe that should be "wholesale discount". I read it as such, even though the terminology is not totally correct.

And as Ms. Brown indicated, if there are any other type similar corrections that need to be made, you can Just give those to her and she will be glad 0 incorporate that.

Issue 2, likewise, there is the inclusion of the reference to the Telecommunications Act. I would assume that our previous discussion would apply here as well.

MR. MELBOM: Yes, sir.
MS. BROWI: Commissioner Deason, once again let me put this one on the record, this correction. And I apologize.

After "incumbent LEC" in the statement or Issue 2, the issue should read "What conditions or modifications, if any, should the Commission impose?" That was left out.

MR. EARLV: Could you rapeat that?
48. Brownt Sure. It's the same as the
issue that was incorporated in the order establishing procedure. It should be "What cunditions or modifications, if any, should the Commission impose?"

Comorrasiongr deasont And the way I read this, Issue 1 strictly is "Should a certificate be granted?" And Isaue 2 is "If there is one, should there be any conditions, and if so, what are they?"

In a nutshell, that's what we're tryin to accomplish.
Any changes or corrections to the positions on Issue 2? We now have additional proposed issues. We'll begin with BellSouth's issues. There are a series of three here which address managerial, technical and financial capability. Mr. Early?

3R. EMrLy: Bellsouth BSE believes that these are the issues that should be for consideration by the Commission, but to the extent that they can be considered as part of Issue 1, then we don't have any objection to their being rolled in.

COMOMBSIOMRR DEABOF: Well, my question is -- and I guess I'll address this to the other parties -- are these matters really at issue with any party?

MR. MoGLOTHLIM: Commissioner, we don't dispute the expertise. What we contend is that the expertise is derivative of BellSouth ani would be perceived as such. So I tend to agree with Staff that these additional issues can be addressed with Issues 1 and 2. That would be our position.

If this is broken out, we would say that the Commission should more or less pierce the corporate veil and recognize that any expertise or funding that BSE has is also BellSouth's, and it all comes part and
parcel to the same basic contention.
If BSE is offering to roll those in 1 and 2, I think I would be in a position to do the same with respect to the additional issue $I$ have in here.
comprssionzr DEMsOM: And that issue --
okay. This is FCCA's issue-
MR. MogLOTHLIM: We saw that as a separate stand-alone question of law, but I don't disagree that it could be addressed within the framework of the general issues.
comarssiomer deason: Is there any objection, then, to excluding these issues, the three issues proposed by BellSouth on technical, financiai, and managerial, as well as the FCLA position, all with the understanding that the subject mitter is subsumed within the two previous issues?

MRR. ENRLY: No objection.
Ms. BROWI: Staff has no cbjection to that. We still have the question of laws proposed by BellSouth. I have this identified in the later draft of the prehearing order, Commissioner, on Page 10 as Issue C, and then there is also an Issue D.

Staff believes that both of these issues can also be addressed in the Issue 1 and Issue 2.

COMATESIONER DEABON: Mr. Early?

MR. EARLY: Again, Issue $C$ ri lates directly to the fact that there doesn't appear to be a significant dispute that BellSouth BSE has the managerial, financial, and technical capability to act as an ILEC; and to the extent that that is adequately covered in Issue 1, Issue 1 does reference back to 364.337. We would have no objection to their being taken up in Issue 1 in that context. I think the same with Issue D.

COMUIBEIOIER DEASON: Okay.
MR. BARLY: Issue D, I guess, would be more related to Issue 2 .

COMAISAIOMER DEABOK, Any objection, then, with the deletion of the two proprsed issues of questions of law, with the understanding that to the extent necessary they can be addressed within Issues 1 and 2?

3R. 2GELSOM: No objection.
COMISSIOMER DEASON: No objection. Staff
has no objection?
Mg. BROWI: No objection.
Comussioner densom: Very well. That then cencludes the discussion of all proposed issues, correct?

M8. BROWN: That's correct.

COMMIggYOMER DEABOM: Then we car proceed to Section 7, Exhibit List. Any questions or zhanges? (No response.)

Section 8, Proposed Stipulations. There are none. And Section 9, Pending Motions, and it's my understanding there's nothing pending at this time.

MR. HoGLOTHLIM: That may be correct, Commissioner. If it's appropriate, I'd like to ask permission for FCCA and for parties to make brief opening statements at the outset of the hearing.

COMDIBSIOMER DEABOMt Any opjection to brief opening statements? (No response.)

What is an appropriate time period,
Mr. MoGlothlin?
MR. MoGLOTHETH: Five minttes would serve me.

COMDIEsIOMER DEAsOA: Any objection, then, to a five-minute iimitation on opening statements? (No response.)

Okay. Please reflect that so the presiding officer at the haaring will know that opensng statements are contemplated and that there's a five-minute limit on those statements.

MB. BROLR: We will, Commissioner. There is one more matter that I would like to bring up.

MR. EARLY: If I could have --
M8. Brownt I'm Borry, Go aheac.
10R. ERRLY: If I could have a question
related to that last ruling. Is it each party individually will be allowed an opening statement? I know that FCCA, MCI and -- I don't recall -- anyway, we have three parties that have filed testimony jointly, and they appear to be proceeding through this as a -- jointly. Was that a single opening argument of five minutes, or is it going to be each --
comorgssioner deasowi Mr . McGlothlin?
MR. HogLorilim: It wasn't intended to be. We've tried to consolidate some things for convenience and to facilitate things, but we've always maintained our separate intervention status.

COMDISEIOMER DEABON: I thirik they would have the ability to have five minutes per individual party, but I would certainly request that the parties not be repetitious. The commission has a limited amount of time, and to the excent one person's argument captures all the others, it's okay to say, I agree with Mr. Smith and just move on.

M8. BROWH: Comissioner Deason,
BellSouth BSE filed rebuttal testimony in this case. That's correct; isn't it Mr. Early?

MR. ERRLY: Yes.
24. BROMn: I don't know how the parties
feel about handiing direct and rebuttal testimony at the same time at the hearing. It would be all right with staff if BellSouth would like to do that.
comorssioner peasorit Mr. Gillan has both direct and rebuttal testimony?

MR. EARLY: Mr. Scheye.
COMEIBSIONER DEASOA: I'm sorry; Mr. Scheye has both direct and rebuttal. Is there a purpose as to having that done simultaneously or to having it broken out separately?

MR. EARLY: I think it's -- from
BellSouth BSE's perspective, it's a pretty simple issue. And although I suppose if here are issues taken up in Mr. Gillan's testimony that relate to the potential for anticompetitive behevior and that testimony is accepted over a relevincy or materiality objection, then we would want to have the opportunity to produce Mr. Scheye for rebuttal.

CONUTSEIOMER DEABOM: We don't have an overabundant number of witnesses, and so let's just for sake of clarity we'11 have Mr. Scheye retake the stand and do his rebuttal testimony.
48. BROWn: All right.

16R. MogLorimilit Mr. Deason, I ha e one more item, and it requires some clarification by both the Commission and BSE. The prehearing order required that discovery be completed by April 13th.

Both FCCA and Staff filed some
interrogatories prior to the 13 th , but the answers weren't due until afterwards. BSE has responded to Staff. At this point they have not responded to FCCA. I think the answers were to fall due on the 20 th and I ask whether Mr. Early's client intends to respond to our questions.

MR. ERRLY: We did respond -- you did get our response to your first interrogatories, didn't you?

MR. MagLotillit: Yes.
MR. ENRLY: And we have an idditional set of interrogatories, and it's our intent to answer them. comarssioner deasont Very wall.

JR. EARLY: I think I calculated the 19 th or the 20th, but you'11 get them.

MR. MogLothlym: okay. Very good.
COMATBEIOMER DEAsOAI: Any other matters?
Ms. BRomit Not that Staff is aware of, Commissioner.

COMURSSIOMER DEAsOM: Very well. Thank you
all. This prehearing conference is adjor ned.
(Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
9:55 a.m.)


STATE OF FLORIDA)

## CERTIFICAT: OF REPORTER

COUNTY OF LEON )
I, H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter,

DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. $971056-\mathrm{TX}$ was heard by the Prehearing officer at the time and place herein stated; it is further

CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 19 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.

H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR

Official Commission Reporter
(904) 413-6734

