1	PARTICIPATING:
2	RICHARD TUDOR and LAURA KING, Division of Communications
4	MARTHA BROWN, Division of Legal Services
5	BOB ELIAS, Division of Legal Services
6	CINDY MILLER, Office of General Counsel
7	MIKE ELLIS, Sprint
8	CHARLES REHWINKLE, Sprint
9	MARTIN SIPPLE, Sprint
LO	DONNA MCNULTY, MCI
11	JENNIFER SPADE, MCI
12	MARSHA RULE, AT&T
L3	SUE DECKER, AT&T
L4	
15	
16	SIGNING INTERPRETER: STEVIE FENTON
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER DEASON:

to order. We're on Item 4.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You should have available to you our recommendation of

Call the agenda back

February 8th, and then the interim proposals from the

MR. TUDOR: Good morning, Commissioners.

three bidders, and then a comparison chart that we did

of the three bidders' proposals on the interim.

Just to give you a little background and bring you up to date, as you recall on January 11th you issued a decision of your intent to award a three-year contract to Sprint for relay service. January 14th, AT&T filed a notice of its intent to protest and did file that on January 24th.

That formal protest stayed any further activity on the permanent contract, and the current contract expires May 31st, the contract with MCI. at this point, we have no contract for service after that date.

It's mandatory under the law that we have a service provider in the state by June 1st. currently we have no contract for that so we believe an emergency situation exists. Our rules provide for an emergency procurement when an emergency exists.

We have before us interim proposals from

AT&T, Sprint and MCI. MCI, of course, did not bid on the permanent contract but they are the current provider, and so their proposal would be to extend their current service beyond the May 31st expiration date.

I'd like to refer you to the last page of the recommendation, if I could, which is a time line, and just highlight a couple of things there.

On the time line, you can see there the protest period is laid out on the second row there.

The hearing is scheduled on the DOAH protest on February 24th, which is next Thursday. And the time frame allowed for the recommended ordered and exceptions and so forth carry us sometime into early May. So we would expect a decision on the DOAH protest in the month of May. What would happen after that, of course, we can't predict. There could be a court appeal or the DOAH protest could finalize the protest.

Down at the bottom of the page there are a couple of rows, and I just want to highlight that where they are talking above the word "or" or below it, we're looking at a time period from now until May where someone will need time to prepare to provide service on June 1st. So we need to make a decision

shortly that would let people know that they can begin the effort that they'll need to undertake so that they are prepared to provide service June 1st.

On the comparison between the providers, if it's all right, I'd like to go through that briefly.

I think that might help gather our thoughts on the comparison between each of them.

Each of the bidders has proposed to have service ready June 1st, 2000, and that's essential and they've all provided that. The minimum duration of the interim contract for AT&T is six months and MCI six months. Sprint differentiates here. And if a provider ultimately is selected other than Sprint, they would require a six-month contract also. If in May the DOAH process is over and we enter into a permanent contract with Sprint, then we would not operate under the interim contract at all. We would just go straight to the permanent contract.

Each of the providers offer an option to extend beyond that minimum period. Each of them have a provision about our notice to cancel or extend the contract. AT&T and MCI, 60 days notice, and Sprint would be 60 days if someone else besides them is selected for the permanent. But if they are awarded the permanent contract, then there would be no time

notice required to go straight to a permanent contract.

The per minute rates are different. AT&T's is a rate of 69 cents a minute, which is the same rate as they proposed in their permanent proposal. MCI has proposed during the first six-month period of the extension, their charge would be -- as opposed to their current 60 cents -- would be 71.5 cents per minute, and if we go to a second six-month period it would go 85 cents a minute.

Sprint's proposal starts off with a rate, if we operate under the interim contract at all, it would be 85 cents per minute. If they are ultimately the company selected as the permanent provider, and if that interim contract were in place for a period of 10 to 11 months, then there would be a credit off of that 85 cents of 2.5 cents, so the effective rate back to June 1st would be 82.5, or 79 cents if we were under it for a full 12 months. So a range of between 79 to 85 cents, depending on how long we operated under it.

Termination charges. This is a significant item. AT&T has proposed no termination charges. Now, there is -- they did have one caveat that if we cancelled the interim contract on less than 60 days notice, that they would want to recover such costs

incurred by them which are non-recoverable. That's not defined. But in all likelihood, we would not be able to cancel in less taken 60 days notice anyway because someone else would need time to gear up, so that may not be an issue.

MCI proposed no termination charge. Sprint has proposed, again, differentiated depending upon whether they receive the permanent contract or not. If they receive the permanent contract, there's no termination charge. If they did not receive the permanent contract, depending upon the period of time, there will be termination charges of either 500,000, if they provide the interim service for six to nine months, and if it's 10 to 12 months, 250,000 termination charge.

Liquidated damages. AT&T has offered in their interim proposal that they would operate under the liquidated damages provision of MCI's current contract. That MCI current contract provision is essentially the same as our RFP requirement. The difference is a force majeure clause, and, then, also a provision that if the problem that exists is not their fault, if it's something, for example, that the state caused, they would not be liable for liquidated damages.

And, also, in their interim proposal, they propose no cap, while they did proposal a cap in their permanent proposal.

MCI would continue operating under their current contract liquidated damages provision, except that for each of the six-month periods we would have interim service, they would have a cap on theirs of 300,000. And then Sprint proposes to operate under the same liquidated damages provision as is in their permanent proposal.

All three of the bidders indicated that they would not be able to provide service from an in-state center during the interim period. And I think that's a very reasonable provision. All three of those proposed that.

There are some additional provisions in each of them that there are a little different. And the first one, AT&T, basically they've said they will operate under their permanent proposal with some exceptions. One exception would be that in-state center. Another would be that they would operate under a different liquidated damages clause, the one that MCI is operating under today.

MCI says that they also would not operate -be required to operate under an in-state center. They also indicated they would put a cap on their liquidated damages of 300,000. And then the other provision they have is that the PSC must make an agreement that their service has been satisfactory throughout the initial contract period, which would be including all the way up until May 31st of 2000. And then Sprint, another provision in their's, is that their interim offer is good only through today.

So that's the three proposals. We have representatives here from AT&T and MCI and Sprint.

And if there's been any misunderstanding of my description of their interim proposal, I'm sure they will let you know that. Now would be a good time to hear from the parties or Staff can answer questions. Either one.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Mr. Rehwinkel.

MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you, Commissioners.

My name is Charles Rehwinkel. I'm here representing Sprint Communications Company, Limited Partnership.

I have here with me today Mike Ellis, Sprint Relay Services Manager and Andrew Brenneman, also with Sprint Relay Services, Sales Division. We have also brought Martin Sipple, of the Ausley firm, who is outside counsel for Sprint in the bid protest.

I'd like to make a few brief remarks regarding Staff's recommendation. Mr. Brenneman and Ellis are here to answer questions. I think Mr. Ellis would be your primary contact there regarding the interim proposal.

And because we feel that the outcome of the bid protest itself is so crucial to your consideration here today, I've asked Mr. Sipple to address the status of the DOAH proceeding from the perspective of his expertise in bid procurement law.

At the outset, Commissioners, Sprint believes that the Staff has captured the most relevant concept at this juncture of the process, and that is the avoidance of disruption of service to customers.

You cannot look at this thing in a vacuum.

You are not here on a procurement based solely on a
desire to provide relay services. You are here
because of the situation you find yourselves in.

This is the very first time the Commission in almost ten years have been faced with a bid protest. This has thrown severe uncertainty into the process, in a process that is already burdened with already tight time frames.

MCI has indicated to you an inclination to exit the Florida market. Customers are facing a

service transition for the very first time in this service's history. Now, we think that the service transition is a crucial consideration to you.

I'm not here to try to snow you and convince you that Sprint is -- it wants to do anything other than provide service and earn a fair return on its investment in this process.

We have proposed a solution that is soundly based on fundamental business principles of costing.

It is one that I think if you look at all the proposals is based on the most thorough consideration of the risks facing the provider and the Commission.

Mr. Tudor's presentation of Sprint's proposal in here was an accurate one. You will notice a price differential that is significant. You will notice a termination liability or penalty that the other providers are not proposing.

But I think you need to keep in mind that

Sprint is concerned about serving the very community

that depends on relay service and doing it well, as

the permanent proposal has also demonstrated. That is

why we have submitted the interim proposal in a effort

to provide a seamless transition to a single provider.

The Commission is in the unfortunate position to need to protect consumers and meet the

requirements of federal law and avoid the sanctions that you will incur if you do not have a provider in place on June 1st.

Our option is one that we would like you to consider, not as your desired solution or the one that you're ultimately going to have to utilize, but really a safety net in case the protest does not -- is not supported at the Department of Administrative Hearings. We are very confident that the law is on the Commission's side in the protest hearing.

The point that we would like to emphasize is that if you consider that the outcome of the DOAH process will be that the Commission's concern with liquidated damages as being a material provision of the RFP and really the only hammer that you have in enforcing the contract is upheld, then you really need to consider selecting an interim provider that will be the same as the likely permanent provider, and that's Sprint.

This process is one that does not lend itself to fungible providers just coming in and going out. There are long lead times in preparing sites, training personnel, and doing all the other business transactions that are important in setting up a service that will be one that is fundamental to the

users of the service, one that discharges a very serious and important federal and state obligation.

That's one reason why we have the February 15th date in here. It's not because we're trying to put pressure on the Commission to make a decision here today. We have business contracts that need to be signed that we do not have any flexibility in extending it for significant periods of time. In fact, the 15th was a date that we actually got some leeway to extend to today because this is -- was the first opportunity you were going to have to select a provider on an interim basis. So I don't want you to be put off by that provision in there.

I would like to urge the Commission to look at the interim solution as not the desired solution. There is, as Mr. Sipple will tell you, a very strong likelihood that the DOAH proceeding will be concluded prior to June 1st, and there will be, hopefully, an opportunity for the Commission to sign a permanent contract with Sprint such that you will not need to utilize the provisions of any of the interim providers proposals. We think there is an equally high probability that the Commission's strong legal position will prevail.

For this reason, we think it would not make

sense to go from MCI in the month of May to AT&T for the month of June until the DOAH protest is finally resolved, to Sprint, which we think will be the prevailing party.

What you have in that situation is three providers in a period of -- a relatively short period of time. You have two transition points. And two transition points means one additional point of failure potential in your relay service.

We're not suggesting that because you're transitioning from one to another that there's going to be a failure or breakdown in service. It's only that you're increasing the likelihood that that occurs. And if the Commission is confident that they will prevail on appeal -- in the protest, I mean, then it does not make sense to interject a third provider in that scenario. You should have a transition from MCI to Sprint.

Now, that's addressing the AT&T proposal.

Certainly the AT&T proposal has a lower price that

does not have the termination liability. But I would

contend to you that if you look at the proposals that

are before the Commission, Sprint is the one that has

a comprehensive proposal ready for you to sign. AT&T

has a proposal that says, "We'd like to do this. Here

are some of the terms." But they have not negotiated everything that would need to be done to be able to go into business.

There's also an indication in AT&T's proposal that they will put a -- the service in place and then start aggressively pursuing an in-state solution.

Now, an in-state solution is not what the Commission requires for the first few months, even of the permanent solution. But it is a requirement of the permanent solution. And to me what that indicates is that AT&T was not prepared, had not thought out exactly how they were going to discharge the permanent process were they to get that business.

Now, let me address MCI for a second. It may seem that the easiest thing for the Commission to do under my theory of two providers instead of three, and minimizing the failure point possibilities, would be to just go with MCI's extension proposal.

I would urge the Commission to be very careful about that. Not that -- I'm not here to knock MCI's proposal or their service. My concern is that you have -- you're going to be going before DOAH on the issue of liquidated damages and the materiality of that requirement in the RFP. And you've voted and

said that is a material provision. That is something that is important. And you'll be defending that position at DOAH.

MCI has proposed that the liquidated damages be capped at \$300,000. Now, AT&T was failed in the permanent proposal by capping them because they capped them at a million dollars. To go in and accept a cap on damages at \$300,000 I think would be very damaging to your legal position before DOAH. Mr. Sipple can address that in detail if you have any questions about that. Plus there's a request in MCI's proposal that you stop monitoring calls.

I'm not suggesting that there would be a desire to degrade service, but certainly when you have an entity that has decided to change their business plan and exit the market, you should be concerned about what service levels you're providing to customers.

Just because there's an interim solution does not mean that you would give any lower level of service. And I'm not suggesting that's what MCI would be proposing to do. It just would undermine your position, I think, on the permanent process if you were to accept a lower level of service guarantee, which is what liquidated damages give you, and that's

what the monitoring clause gives you. So that's kind of one of the conditions or qualifiers to their extension proposal. It comes at a half a cent a minute lower than Sprint's permanent proposal.

So I've addressed AT&T and MCI's proposals and why I think that the Sprint proposal is the better proposal. Only because it is one that would transition on June 1st to the provider that is ultimately going to be there. It has the customers transitioning once, assuming the assumptions that I do, that you have an excellent legal position with the Department of Administrative Hearings's case.

With that, Commissioners, I would just like to ask your indulgence to listen to Marty Sipple briefly address the merits of the DOAH protest because, again, we think that is the keystone or should be the keystone to your decision-making on the interim provider.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Please proceed. Do it briefly.

MR. SIPPLE: Thank you, Commissioners.

I will try to be brief on this.

Just as Mr. Rehwinkel said, we believe that the premise of your decision today on the interim contract ought to be that Sprint is going to be the

permanent contract provider. And the reason for that is because in terms of an analogous situation you might be familiar with in Circuit Court lawsuits, the likelihood of success on the merits here are so low for AT&T that it's virtually certain that Sprint's going to end up with this contract in a few months.

The issue in the bid protest, which will be heard next week, as you know, is whether the Commission acted arbitrarily and capriciously in rejecting AT&T's proposal. And the reason the Commission rejected AT&T's proposal is because it would not agree to the liquidated damages provision that's in the RFP.

Now, before I even talk about the merits of that at all, it's important to emphasize -- what I just said there, what the standard is, which is did this Commission act arbitrarily and capriciously?

This hearing next week is not a forum for the Administrative Law Judge to second-guess this Commission's decision. The standard of arbitrarily and capriciously is extremely high for AT&T to meet. It basically in the law means that this Commission acted illogically, despotically, with no factual basis whatsoever. That's an incredibly high standard to meet. The purpose of the entire bid protest law in

this state is avoid collusion, fraud and those kinds of situations in awarding contracts. And really, Commissioners, the statement of the test gives you your answer of whether AT&T's going to prevail or not.

Obviously, there's none of that in this case. There's been no collusion. There's been no fraud. The Staff worked very hard on judging the proposals for the permanent contract just as they have on giving you this background for the interim contract. They worked very hard. Detailed, factual reasoning and there's absolutely no basis for anybody to say that anything was done arbitrarily and capriciously.

So just on the standard alone, it's virtually -- it's very difficult to win these cases for any protester. And I have been on both sides of the fence in these cases. And I can tell you that sitting in AT&T's chair in a bid protest is no fun. It's a no fun place to sit. It's a virtually impossible burden to satisfy.

Now, with that standard of proof in mind, the merits of the case are actually pretty clear. I mean, it's an easy case, really.

AT&T's position is basically, first, that their refusal to agree to the liquidated damages

provision is not material. And second, that they were somehow treated differently than Sprint in that regard. If you look at the facts, you'll see that neither one of those positions carries any weight whatsoever.

As to the materiality, this Commission is subject to a 100,000 per day fine from the FCC if it doesn't provide this relay service in the manner required. Now, the private vendor isn't subject to that. The Commission is. And so the liquidated damage provision is the key, is the absolute key to holding that private vendor to providing the service in the manner it's supposed to be provided. So that's an incredibly material provision of this contract.

AT&T refused to agree to it, as it's written in the RFP, and instead wanted to cap its liability. That's a very significant advantage that it tried to get that none of the other companies demanded.

Sprint, in particular, specifically agreed to the terms of the RFP liquidated damages provision, and by refusing to do that, AT&T really obtained a significant advantage; probably enabled it to propose a lower price. And so it's just absolutely certain that it's a material provision.

And, finally, as to being treated

differently than Sprint, the sort of slender reed that AT&T is basing this bid protest on is the fact that in an optional non-scored part of the RFP proposal, Sprint proposed some different language on limitation of liability. But --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Did we accept that language?

MR. SIPPLE: No. Absolutely not. And you're not required to. That's the key difference.

Sprint accepted the RFP language and it said we'd like to talk about it. But the PSC's under absolutely no obligation to talk about -- to change anything, let alone even talk about it. That's an entirely different footing than AT&T, which basically, if they were ever awarded this contract and it came around time to sign the contract, the PSC would be in the position of asking for a concession from AT&T in order to get that liquidated damage provision that it wants. And so I'm a lawyer, I'm not a businessman, but even I can understand that that's an entirely different footing than Sprint's agreement to the provision up-front.

So based on all of that, Commissioners, I think it's pretty clear that a couple months from now Sprint's going to be awarded this contract. And for

the reasons that Mr. Rehwinkel described, your decision today ought to be premised on that, and 2 3 premised to avoid this leapfrogging of different 4 companies in the next few months. And the interim 5 contract ought to be awarded to Sprint. Thanks a lot. 6 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. McNulty. 7 sorry, I didn't mean to skip someone. Are you --8 MS. McNULTY: She's with AT&T. 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: All right. Well, we'll hear from AT&T then. 10 11 MS. DECKER: Thank you, good morning. Sue Decker. 12 13 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry, your name 14 again? 15 MS. DECKER: I'm Sue Decker. And I'm the General Manager of AT&T's Relay Division. And I'm 17 joined this morning by Marsha Rule, who is our attorney. She'll be addressing the legal issues when 18 19 I'm done with my comments. 20 And my purpose today is to ask you to select AT&T as the interim relay provider. Because we stand 21 22 by the offer submitted in the response to the recent RFP, I can assure you, and the relay users throughout 23 24 the state of Florida, that by selecting us, you will

be experiencing the best relay service that the

industry has to offer and at the most competitive price.

You see, during the recent RFP evaluation process, AT&T received the highest marks for its technical proposal, ranking it superior to its competitors, and as I mentioned before, offered at the best price, which was 69 cents per minute, equating to a cost savings of more than a million dollars over the life of the contract. That's one million dollars of savings to Florida consumers.

This is an outstanding offer, which is backed by AT&T's corporate commitment to invest capital dollars upon the award of the permanent contract, to build a state-of-the-art in-state center, which, by the way, I would like to point out, will be staffed by AT&T employees. Because you see, AT&T owns its product and we own our centers. We do not outsource, not even for a single mile.

Additionally, because we are internally organized in AT&T's Consumer Markets Division, we are offering Florida relay users free long distance for the first three months the new center is open. This is an unprecedented offer in the relay industry, and one I would be happy to see started here in the state of Florida.

And, finally, I want to assure you that it was always AT&T's intent to comply with the liquidated damages requirements in the RFP. And by selecting AT&T as an interim provider --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: How did we know that?

MS. DECKER: In our response we emphasized

that we would be willing to sit down and negotiate and

try to reach a mutually acceptable position on

liquidated damages.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You --

MS. DECKER: So in closing, I'd like to say that by selecting AT&T as the interim provider, you would be ensuring the very best relay service, at the very best price the industry has to offer. And by denying citizens of Florida with the very best -- I mean we -- you know, just to deny the citizens of the Florida with the very best because of this misunderstanding would truly be such a great disservice. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. Rule, do you have something to add? Well, before you do, we're going to take a break. Okay. We're going to take a ten-minute recess, and then you'll have your opportunity. Okay.

(Short break.)

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Call the agenda back to order. Ms. Rule.

MS. RULE: Thank you. I'm Marsha Rule with AT&T. I'll keep my remarks brief.

It was not our intent today to address the bid protest issue but I would like to respond to some of the comments that Sprint raised.

AT&T has hired outside counsel. The outside counsel are handling the matter. And rather than put forth all of the arguments we intend to put forth at DOAH, I would like to let you know that we have a very different opinion on the ultimate result at DOAH than Mr. Sipple does.

As you know, AT&T's bid proposal had the lowest price out of any provider. It was ranked the highest in quality. As a result, however, of what we believe for an unfortunate misunderstanding of their offer, the Staff recommended that you disqualify AT&T.

Mr. Sipple repeatedly told you that AT&T refused to agree to liquidated damages. And had this been the case, Mr. Sipple would be correct. The question would be whether the Commission acted arbitrarily or capriciously. However, for reasons we would be happy to explain to you, we could walk you through the RFP, we could walk you through the bid

response, we could give you an explanation of it that we think you would be very satisfied with. That's not the case. We were responsive. The real question before DOAH is whether our response was within the realm of acceptable responses according to bid procurement law. That is, did we answer your question? We say we did. We didn't refuse liquidated damages by any means.

Due to this unfortunate misunderstanding, we find ourselves in the posture of being forced to institute a bid protest, although that was the last thing we wanted to do. But it's practically the only avenue available to us in this particular procurement.

What I would very much like to do is have you schedule a separate oral argument period. I would love to be able to show you specific provisions in the RFP and explain our response to you. We intended to be responsive. We intended to accept Staff's terms. We put forth the absolutely best price. We added some free long distance, and our proposal was the highest ranked technically. And I think you can look at the spreadsheet that Staff prepared and you can see how favorably AT&T's compares.

I really don't want to be here making legal arguments to you today, but I would like you to take

the opportunity to consider that perhaps there was a misunderstanding and that we needn't be at odds with each other. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. McNulty.

MS. McNULTY: Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Donna McNulty representing MCI WorldCom. With me today is Jennifer Spade from MCI WorldCom who is the Sales Director for Government Markets. She would like to briefly address you regarding this matter, and she's here to respond to any questions you may have.

MS. SPADE: Good morning. Can you hear me?

By the way, I'm a sales director and not an attorney, so I won't go into any legal debates.

What I do want to put forth is we were requested to assist the State of Florida in an extension or interim period, and that's what we felt we did. That we offered a reasonable offer for service as an extension, and we feel that our offer of extension is the path of least resistance. It offers the least amount of disruption, as the gentlemen from Sprint talked about, going from one carrier to another. And there is a transition period. And what we want to ensure is that the consumers in the state of Florida are taken care of during this interim period. We do not want any additional disruption in

service.

We feel that to use MCI's service for the next six months, or six months beyond that if the Commission so elected to do so, is a consistency of feature and functionality. When you go from one service provider to another service provider, features are somewhat different. So the consumer then is learning a different process in how to dial and make telecommunications calls via TTY and via relay service.

Another point I'm interested in making, the gentlemen from Sprint also talked about MCI WorldCom getting out of the relay business and that's flat out not true.

We were a technology provider, as a subcontractor to Vista, that was excluded from the bid process because their price was higher than Sprint and AT&T.

So MCI continues to provide service in various states throughout the nation and will continue to look at each state and each opportunity on a case-by-case basis.

And we feel that as far as our proposal and looking at the prior termination of the contract, which ends in May, is that we look at the interim

contract as simply just an extension to allow the Florida PSC to evaluate and go through the protest period, again to offer assistance in this interim solution so that it doesn't complicate matters further, but rather we just offer that solution to you.

And, secondarily, MCI's rate is just slightly higher than the AT&T's interim solution, and, again, it's the path of least resistance.

And then my final point is that MCI
WorldCom, although we've asked for the flexibility to
extend calls outside of the state, we continue to
operate a Florida Miami Center in that we have our
subcontractor that manages that call center for us,
and we intend to have calls go in that center as much
as possible. But through the normal attrition that
would happen as you then get ready to transition to
another provider, we would then want that flexibility
to go to another state.

So, again, the interim solution would continue to provide dollars back to the State of Florida, as well as employment for those relay operators within the state.

So under all of these considerations, that we feel that MCI WorldCom, again, is the best solution

during the interim contract. And thank you very much for your consideration.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you. Questions, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I have a question, I guess, probably for Sprint.

You propose a termination fee if you're not awarded the permanent contract. I want to explore the basis for that. Could you walk me through that?

MR. ELLIS: This is Mike Ellis with Sprint National Sales Manager, based out of Denver Colorado.

Yes, the termination fees are directly tied to the costs that Sprint absorbs with our securing a center in the state of Florida. Maybe this is a good time to clarify Mr. Tudor's previous summary.

In the comparison of in-state traffic requirements, Sprint's offering for the interim proposal will plan to have to have a center up and running in the state by June 1 in Miami. All we asked was for relief of the percentage of the 80 percent traffic in-state during that interim period. So Sprint will be offering that economic development during that interim period in Miami. And the termination costs are directly tied to a leasehold agreement with that facility.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So you are going to be handling traffic outside of the state but at the same time you're going to be bringing up your in-state facility; is that correct?

MR. ELLIS: That is correct.

your price per minute is declining over time. But I guess my question goes to -- in the event that the -- your interim contract lasts beyond 12 months, at least 12 months, you offer a 79 cents per minute rate. But if you get the permanent contract, your rate never goes below 85. I found that difficult to understand. It seemed like they should be similar, if not the same.

MR. ELLIS: If the interim proposal goes a full year, Sprint offers a credit of 6 cents for the subsequent year.

MR. ELLIS: So the credit period for one year would be for the same length of the interim agreement. So what would happen, suppose June 1 to May, and June 1, 2001, Sprint's price begins to be 66 cents, a 6-cent credit off of 72. Staff's summary is they applied that credit really assuming a price of 85 cents during that first year. Credit would begin --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Oh, I understand. I understand what you're saying.

So that 79 cents is reflective of the credit as of that time. Then it continues to decrease beyond that. Is that what I understand you to say? The credit continues to be applied beyond that time, is that what I understand you to say? If you get a permanent contract, that credit will continue to be applied.

MR. ELLIS: If we have the interim agreement for a full one year at 85 cents, we would issue a 6-cent credit for one full additional year. So for one year from 2001 through May of 2002 you'd be paying 66 cents on the contract.

MR. TUDOR: Commissioners, if I could clarify that maybe a little bit.

My understanding -- at the point where the permanent rate goes into effect, there would begin to be credits applied if we met the time frames on the interim contract. It is true, as I understand the way they would apply it is, it would apply to minutes purchased in those future months. So since the starting rate under the permanent contract is 72 cents, if you got a credit of six cents per minute, that six cents is coming off of all of those minutes

you've already bought. You're getting a rebate, if you would. It's coming off of those -- it's applying to those minutes you've already bought in the previous months before the permanent contract goes in.

Now, the way it's going to be returned to the state is that that 72-cent rate would be reduced by six cents until as many minutes have been used up on a going-forward basis as were purchased during the interim period at 85 cents. It's a matter of semantics whether you say it's 85 with 6 cents off, and so the effective rate is 79 cents, or if you say the actual rate you get billed in the first month under the permanent is 72 minus 6 cents. Either way you're getting a 6-cent refund, if you would, or credit, based on all of those minutes that you purchased under the interim contract. And how you say it doesn't matter. The dollars are the same.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: The 6 cents is the difference between 85 and 79?

MR. TUDOR: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And that's dependent upon the duration of the interim period.

MR. TUDOR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Going back to the issue of the -- your establishment of the Florida

Center, during the interim contract I would expect 2 that you're going to phase that whole facility in, so that during an interim contract you're not going to 3 carry all of the traffic from Florida in that Florida 4 5 facility. I just want to be sure on that. MR. ELLIS: That's part of the original 6 7 proposal that Sprint has under the permanent contract. The requirement is that 80 percent of that traffic be 8 handled --9 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: You're going to --10 MR. ELLIS: That center will be designed to 11 handle 80 percent of the traffic. All we've asked is 12 13 for the interim period that we have relief on that 80 14 percent. 15 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's my question. Your relief in the interim essentially says you're 16 going to get less than 80 percent traffic in the 17 Florida facility. 18 19 MR. ELLIS: That is correct. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Any further questions? 21 Motion? 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I can move that we approve Staff recommendation on this

25

item.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm real concerned about the termination charges, as I indicated.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm concerned about the termination charges also.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: The concern comes -- and I understand the company's rationale here.

Two things occur to me. One is there's a great difference in the termination charges from -- if we terminate between six and nine months as opposed to between nine and twelve months of approximately half. That given the rationale of the company, I don't see how that computates. If the idea is if you gear up this facility and if you don't get the contract, then you have to recover the cost of the facility, I guess what they are saying is that by operating for an additional three months they'll cover half of those costs.

I'm not persuaded that the fees that we see there -- and I'm quite hesitant to expose the state to that kind of liability. Essentially, we're at the whim of the DOAH judge. If the DOAH judge decides that there's validity in this appeal, after six months we can't give this contract to Sprint, is my understanding. And even if we can appeal we can't give it to them. So are we subject to this half

million dollars if the legal process continues after six months?

MS. BROWN: Commissioner, if I could just clarify the law on that. Section 120.57 provides that once the DOAH hearing officer has made its decision, the process for establishing the permanent contract can go forward.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So if Sprint --

MS. BROWN: Practically speaking that may not happen because Sprint may not want to do it until everything was decided if it were appealed, but we can go forward.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I understand. If the result of the DOAH decision is that there's merit in the appeal, it's my understanding on June 1 we cannot finalize this contract. Is that correct?

MS. BROWN: Well, a couple of things happen at that point. The decision that the DOAH ALJ makes comes back to us in the form of a proposed recommended order. And then we approve or disapprove that and issue a final order.

Our review of their proposed order is limited. As I'm sure you're aware, we pretty much have to take the judge's factual determinations. And there are some limits to the scope of our review of

his legal determinations. But at that point, as I understand it, we have several choices. We can go forward. We can pursue the case on appeal. We can --we have provided the hearing required under 120.57 and we can pursue the award as well. We can reject all bids. We could award the contract to the Sprint. We have all of those options.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I have a question for Sprint. If Sprint does not receive the interim contract but prevails in the protest, how long after the protest decision is made will Sprint be able to provide service?

MR. ELLIS: Mr. Commissioner, there would be a minimum of six months, which is typical in the industry for the size of the center that's required in the state.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you.

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner Jacobs, just to respond to your question about the termination charge, if the DOAH hearing officer rules that the bid was without merit and the Commission goes forward with awarding the permanent contract to Sprint, there would be no termination of liability. I just wanted to make sure that was clear. It's only if it goes to someone other than Sprint. Because if it is awarded to

Sprint, then there will be no termination costs that are incurred by Sprint and any lease payment arrangement.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: There has been a motion made. Is there a second or does it die for lack of a second?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Let me try to offer something here that might fall in line with the motion.

In my mind there ought to be a process at the time that the DOAH decision is made. No matter who we give this contract to, we come in and we allow the company that did the interim contract and if they did not get the permanent, they come in and there's a process whereby we resolve whatever remains to be completed under that interim contract. I'm unwilling to accept up-front a liquidation when I don't see anything that actually gives me support for that. Nor do I see anything that would say how those costs could be mitigated. Whatever costs are incurred by the interim company, I would imagine there could be some litigation by the company that comes in and receives the permanent contract.

I would want to see the process at the time the DOAH decision is made as opposed to accepting a

liquidation provision up-front.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: As I understand it, and Ms. Decker can correct me, under AT&T's proposal, there is no termination charges whatsoever; is that correct?

MS. DECKER: Yes, that's correct. Because we intend to use our existing system to support the Florida traffic during the interim period.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: First of all, I'll see if that would be something that somebody accepted in the motion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't know. It seems to me we have proposals, bid proposals on an interim in effect. I'm not sure we're at liberty to provide for an allowance to change those bids. I mean, isn't that essentially what you're suggesting? You're saying if you change your offer, we will accept it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I guess I am.

MS. BROWN: Well, let me take a stab at this, and, Cindy, if I go off the deep end, please stop me.

We're in a emergency procurement situation.

Our rule, and I don't have the cite, provides that

under an emergency procurement we shall enter into as

much competitive negotiation as the circumstances

permit. That's my language. Let me read it.

"Emergency procurement shall be accomplished with such competition as may be prudent under the circumstances."

What that means to me is that strict procurement practices in normal bids are relaxed for emergency situations where we have to get something in place; we don't have the time. If we want to negotiate here at the table, I don't know why we can't do that under the circumstances.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So Commissioner Jacobs, you're suggesting that it would be -- you would be amenable to accepting the Sprint proposal if the termination charges -- is that what they are?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yeah. There will essentially be a true-up process on the termination charges.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Right. That it would be actual costs of termination not to exceed a certain amount?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yeah. We could -- I don't know what that amount would be. If I were to say off the cuff I would say the lower amount they have here, but I don't know. I'd give Staff some discretion to go back and talk about that.

1 MS. BROWN: We would probably need some sort 2 of response from Sprint at this point. 3 MR. ELLIS: Commissioners, I think Sprint could agree to some type of true-up on the termination 5 charges at such time that were necessary. Again, Sprint's intent here is that this interim agreement 6 7 will never need to be put into place anyway and there 8 would be no termination charges. So the probability of this becoming a risk, in my opinion, is minimal to 9 none. But I'm willing to address that with you. 10 11 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, if it's such a 12 small risk, why are you even asking for termination 13 charges? MR. ELLIS: Because those are fixed costs 14 15 that we do have, and if for some reason the contract 16 were to go to another vendor. 17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: So there's some risk. There is. 18 MR. ELLIS: 19 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes. Yes. And that's why we captured 20 MR. ELLIS: those; solid business development. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question 22 23 with respect to what may happen. Suppose the ALJ says -- agrees that it was 24 arbitrary and capricious, if that is the standard, and I don't, by asking the question, in any way believe that we acted arbitrarily and capriciously, do we have the option of rebidding?

MS. BROWN:

MS. SPADE:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

May I address the Commission? MCI WorldCom, under the FCC guidelines, would be considered the carrier of last resort as long as we are able to provide and continue service. even though there's an emergency order and situation that we have here, MCI, as the incumbent, has offered an interim solution for the Commission. And if Sprint is able to then sit in front of you and negotiate terms, then MCI WorldCom certainly would like to have that similar opportunity. And I'm sure not necessarily speaking on behalf of AT&T, but I'm sure they would like to have that same opportunity.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yeah. That causes me some discomfort; that we're here at the table negotiating. I think we need to make a decision quickly. I mean, that's the reason we've labeled this as emergency because of the time constraints. we're going to entertain counterproposals and try to negotiate, I think to be fair to all, we've got to give time to everyone to respond, and it may be a

never-ending process.

1.8

I think we need to make a decision today on the three proposals we have in front of us without modification; whichever one provides the best quality service at the best price, and other considerations playing into it, we need to make a decision.

My own personal opinion is that's AT&T.

It's the lowest rate. I'm sure they have high quality service. They have agreed to no termination charges.

They do agree to liquidated damages. And I'm sure that they will facilitate a smooth transition once there's a permanent provider chosen, which may be AT&T. We don't know yet.

permanent provider chosen, and it's just subject to a bid protest, which just hearing the two grounds I -- with all due respect to AT&T, I think the -- we did not act arbitrarily and capriciously. They had to have known liquidated damages were a material aspect of it. And I don't think they got treated different than Sprint. I mean, the facts don't just bear it out. And for that reason, and for the issue of --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't see the need -if it were not Sprint, I would say leave it with the

MCI. I don't see changing three times. Because I don't believe that they will be successful on their protest.

Suggesting that AT&T should be granted the interim is in no way reflective upon my opinion whether the Commission acted arbitrarily and capriciously. It's just simply upon the merits of the proposal. I'm looking at the three interim proposals and in my opinion it is by far the best proposal and that's what we should go with.

it, the merits should include an evaluation of the likelihood of -- in my view -- approving them being able to prove what they need to in terms of the bid protest. And this was a process that, you know, was open to everyone. They had the opportunity for 72 hours after the RFP was put out to take issue with what was in the RFP. They didn't do that. There were numerous opportunities to address the materiality of the liquidated damages and they didn't do it.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And I don't debate that. That's a different -- what we have in front of us now is the interim. And I understand you're saying that we need to consider who do we think is going to

win the protest.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And who did we award the permanent contract to.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's correct. But what we have in front of us are three distinct offers for the interim and we need to evaluate what is best for the interim, in my opinion, and that's AT&T.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And I have concerns about it going through three hands at that point.

period before there's going to be a decision made at DOAH. And Sprint has already indicated that once that decision is made, it's going to have to be at least six months before they are prepared to provide the service if they are the ones that prevail. So we're looking for at least six months of an interim provider, and maybe longer than that; maybe up to on year.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Maybe I misunderstood.

I understand, on the protest, if they win, then what will be provided is not interim but under their permanent proposal.

MR. REHWINKEL: Yeah. The six months is only if a interim provider is selected other than ourselves. If we're selected, we're there right away

at the time the DOAH process is final.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: But the contract for the interim is going to be at least six months regardless of who wins.

MR. REHWINKEL: No. If Sprint is the interim provider, and the DOAH process concludes and Sprint is the permanent provider, there will be no six-month minimum. It transitions automatically to the permanent, to the lower permanent price, to all the other provisions.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: If Sprint prevails.

MR. REHWINKEL: That's correct. Yes.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. But the proposal from AT&T, for example, is for a minimum of six months. And if we grant the interim to them, they have the contract for six months regardless of whether Sprint prevails at DOAH.

MR. REHWINKEL: That's not necessarily true. Because AT&T has said they would agree to a 60-day termination window. That is in a subsequent letter they provided to the Commission. It's not in the rec. But you could terminate upon 60 days notice. And it's only if you terminated on less than 60 days notice would there be any possibility that they would want termination charges.

Commissioners, I know the Chairman has asked that the vote go up or down, but Sprint's offer to demonstrate our termination cost is still on the table, so we would agree to make that modification.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, I appreciate that offer, but I don't think it's fair to the other participants to give you latitude to change your proposal without giving them the latitude to do the same. Then we're going to go beyond your deadline of February 15th. Then your whole proposal goes away.

MR. REHWINKEL: If that was taken beyond today, yes, Commissioner, that would be true.

MR. TUDOR: Commissioners, just to clarify, as I read AT&T's proposal, and perhaps we should just ask them to clarify for themselves, but the sentence in the letter says, "AT&T will agree to an interim contract term of a minimum of six months, or for a term of any length of time thereafter, including, but not limited to one year. The interim contract will be extendable on 60 days advanced request." So as I read their proposal it's a minimum of six months, and then we'd have to give them 60 days notice if we wanted to extend --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: That was my understanding also. Maybe we need to ask AT&T what

that language means.

MR. TUDOR: I agree.

MR. REHWINKEL: I'm referring to a February 9th letter where AT&T said they would agree to Section A.24 which states, "The FPSC shall have the right to unilaterally cancel, terminate or suspend any ensuing contract, in whole or in part, by giving the provider 60 days written notice by certified mail." That's the February 9th letter from Ms. Decker to Mr. Tudor.

MR. TUDOR: And that's the same letter I was reading from. It could be -- that could be a conflict within the letter that maybe we should ask AT&T to clarify.

MS. RULE: This is Marsha Rule with AT&T.

I don't believe it is a contract. There's a minimum term and then there's a cancellation provision.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: So the Commission would have the flexibility to terminate the agreement before the expiration of six months, that is giving that we provide 60 days notice.

If we provide 60 days notice, we can terminate before the expiration of six months?

MS. DECKER: Yes, we would be will to entertain that. However, prior to a six-month minimum

term, AT&T would need to recover certain expenses associated with early termination.

Your agreement now. Where does it say in your agreement -- I asked you earlier if there was any contemplation of termination charges whatsoever. You said no. And now I hear that there are. So I need that clarified.

MS. RULE: At the bottom of the page on the February 9th letter, Ms. Decker has just repeated to you what's in the letter. We're not attempting to change our position at this time.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What -- I don't think I have the letter.

MR. TUDOR: In the package that was attached to your chart there's AT&T's proposal. AT&T's materials are all stapled together. It starts with a February 4th, and then a February 7th, and then a February 9th.

MR. REHWINKEL: I think they put the 7th letter in the --

MS. RULE: I guess all I can say is there would have to be an interim contract before a cancellation clause would come into effect.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: You're reading at the

bottom of Page 1 of the February 9th letter? 2 MS. RULE: Yes, sir, I am. 3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's in the event that there is a termination with less than 60 days notice. 5 Yes, sir. 6 MS. RULE: COMMISSIONER DEASON: So if we give at least 7 60 days notice, there's no termination charges? 8 MS. RULE: That's correct. 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Is that Staff's 10 understanding? 11 12 MR. TUDOR: I would agree that the sentence at the bottom of the page does say that if we give 13 them a full 60 days notice -- whenever that occurs, if 14 we give them 60 days notice, then there is no 15 termination charge. 16 17 What I think is still up in the air is the paragraph from the RFP which they quote and say they 18 would agree with versus the statement in the February 19 9th letter below that that says there's a minimum 20 contract term of six months. I believe there is a 21 conflict there. 22 The sentence preceding the quote says, "AT&T 23 proposes the Commission consider its own RFP

requirement in terms of cancellation." I don't know

25

if AT&T is saying we should consider it and they are going to follow it or not. But then down below they say, "We'll agree to an interim contract term of a 3 minimum of six months." MS. RULE: I'm not certain where Mr. Tudor 5 6 was reading from before. Could you point me to that? 7 MR. TUDOR: Yes. The February 9th letter. 8 MS. RULE: Okay. 9 MR. TUDOR: There's an indented quote from the current RFP. 11 MS. RULE: Yes. 12 MR. TUDOR: Okay. And then down below that, about three lines, it says, "Additionally in response to your inquiry, AT&T will agree to an interim contract term of a minimum of six months." 15 16 MS. RULE: Well, I apologize for being tentative. I didn't write the letter. I've read it. 17 18 But I'm not in the same position as if I were the author, but what it says to me is we are standing by 19 20 our response. We are willing to comply with this 21 provision. This provision gives the PSC the right to 22 unilaterally cancel, terminate or suspend the contract 23 upon 60 days notice. 24 COMMISSIONER CLARK: If that 60 days

occurs -- suppose a month into the interim contract

we -- somebody else gets the permanent and we decide to terminate it. We give you 60 days notice. That will be before the six months. I think the question that has been asked is will there be any termination charges if it's less than six months?

MS. DECKER: No, there would not be.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So even if you only provided it for a month, there would be no termination charges?

MS. DECKER: Yes, that's correct.

MR. TUDOR: Then that raises the question of what is meant by the words "a minimum of six months" later on in the letter. The word "minimum" to me says it cannot be cancelled within the first six months. That's the way I read it.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I think what that means is that we can cancel it after six months with no notice if that's our choice because we've provided the minimum period of time. That's the way I would read it. But --

MS. RULE: That would be the way we would read it too. The contract without further action by either party then would expire at six months.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And then there are terms for extending it beyond six months.

1 MS. RULE: Yes, sir. And terms for giving notice to terminate it before the six months. 2 MR. TUDOR: I think the question maybe that 3 4 wasn't asked, using the example from earlier, if we're one month into the interim, and then we give 60 days 5 notice to cancel, we're in agreement that there is no 6 termination charge. The question is at the end of 7 that three months, the one-month interim and the two 8 months notice, can we cancel the contract, period? 9 Can we cancel the contract with no obligation of any kind? 11 MS. RULE: I believe if you give the 60 days 12 notice, according to the RFP, you're giving notice of 13 your intent to terminate in 60 days and that's the end of it. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: The answer is yes? 16 17 MS. RULE: Yes. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioners, we do 18 need -- the interpreter needs a break, if we don't 19 conclude quickly. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Your motion still 21 22 stands. COMMISSIONER CLARK: But it strikes me that 23 24 we've heard a number of modifications. We might want

to give Staff the opportunity to maybe talk to each

one again and come back in about a hour. Because it's -- you know, I'm always hopeful of getting a better deal.

But I personally thought that the process we went through to award the contract to begin with was fair, and it was awarded in an appropriate manner.

And I think it makes sense to consider that fact -- those facts in our decision today.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm okay with that suggestion if Staff thinks they need it. If they don't -- let's hear from Staff.

MR. TUDOR: I just need clarification on whether we stand with people not changing their proposals or whether we're simply talking about clarifications and understanding.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask Cindy and Marsha, do you think under that rule we have the ability to say we'll accept the offer if you modify it in this way. And if they agree to it, have we complied with the requirements of the rule and the law with respect to emergency processes?

MS. BROWN: The question phrased that way, I think yes. With -- we do have the authority to do it. What worries -- I want to take into consideration is Commissioner Deason's concern that all other parties

have the opportunity to participate in that as well.

we're going to get a protest of the interim, and then we'll be trying to get an interim interim proposal.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I understand that too.

I agree that's a consideration.

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioners, if there is a protest of this award, there is no stay in this statute or your rules as there is in the permanent. So you may have a protest but you would not be obligated to discontinue negotiations or signing a contract.

MS. BROWN: Also if I just might add one thing to that, a protest of an emergency award, if the agency can demonstrate the emergency, which I think we can here, that's a tougher road to hoe even than the one AT&T has now.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question.

I know Sprint's offer is only available today. What is the latest we need to do an interim?

MR. TUDOR: We don't have a certain understanding of how late any of the providers could go before they would have to say they simply can't offer an interim service. MCI certainly has service in place. They would have to do some kind of activity

to continue providing service to you, one in terms of extending current contracts, that sort of thing. AT&T and Sprint are in a little different posture. And I don't know exactly how long they could go.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Well --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioners, what's your pleasure? We need to make a decision. Or else if we are going to postpone it we need to make that decision too. We will be losing the interpreter at noon.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Here's my view. If

Staff thinks they are still supporting -- first of

all, I'm -- I essentially am not supportive of Staff's

initial recommendation. We've heard the parties

modify the offer.

My analysis of the offer is, as I understand them to be modified, would be that I agree with the concern that there's a difference in price.

Quite frankly, if I look at this purely as an interim agreement, I'm persuaded to hold price as a very high priority. But I think it is more prudent to look at this on the whole.

I think that on the whole there is -- and Staff did the analysis where if -- not if we -- but if the decision is to support our original award, there

is every opportunity that the permanent provisioning could begin more quickly if the party who has -- if the party who has the interim contract is also the party who has the permanent contract.

1.3

That is an important consideration here.

And as we've already engaged in discussions for the last few minutes, in the opposite view there's all kinds of alternatives that might be out there. In fact, I suspect in the opposite view we probably are at a rebid.

If the appeal does show to have merit, I suspect we're probably looking at a rebid. And in that event, we're back at another interim contract anyway. Probably. Unless we chose to continue the interim contract that's already in place. Given that, I'm prepared to take the modified offer from Sprint consistent with Staff's opinion that it is within the authority we have in the emergency rule, and deny Staff's initial recommendation except that modified.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Is that a motion? Or is that an amendment to the original --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: If that amendment is accepted I'll second the original motion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have concerns about drawing another protest in terms of negotiating with

one party. I think if we want to do that, we should give it a week's period of time for everybody to resubmit a proposal and then decide on that basis.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: The motion is withdrawn.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And you may lose your Sprint proposal because their deadline is February 15th.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's right.

it. Sounds like I want to get -- I want -- then my proposal as a motion probably -- you know what, that's a better consideration. Because I'm kind of uncomfortable with the nature of the affairs today. I simply could not accept the risk that was being supported in the original recommendation. I'm okay with that. If that's the wish of the Commissioners, I'm okay with taking a moment to breathe and coming back with a fresh approach.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You know, it strikes me we could even do it today. We could give everybody three hours, you know, relook at it, come back and make a proposal and then we'll make a decision. Can we get an interpreter back in three hours?

THE INTERPRETER: Is that part of the

consideration?

MS. SPADE: May I say something? We're working with a time line that is a Sprint time line. It's not an MCI WorldCom time line and it's not an AT&T time line. So I feel a three-hour time line, a one-hour time line is putting pressure on two others companies because we have a Sprint time line.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that's a good point.

MS. SPADE: So -- and also, too, the questioning that has been going on all day today has been kind of pushing the companies to a certain type of proposal that you're expecting then to come back, even if it's a week from now.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Say that last part again.

MS. SPADE: That based on the questioning, on the various components of what you've talked about and kind of went through each carrier's proposal, that it appears as if you're wanting various things from various companies. So you're almost like positioning them to respond in a certain way.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that's part of the negotiations. We're telling what we're looking at so you can factor it into what you're willing to

propose back.

I think you made a good point, that it's one party who has made the proposal. And I do understand the basis for putting a deadline up today. But I'm not sure you're going to get a motion that's supported by at least a majority out of this panel.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioners, I'm at the point that we make a decision. Even if it's -- the decision is no decision, we need to conclude this. We have an interpreter who need to leaves immediately and she's been working now for some 45 minutes without a break.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question.

Can we do -- I'd like to conclude it within a week's time. I don't want it to go any further. Is there any way we can do a special agenda, continue this agenda, only this item, for a week?

MR. TUDOR: That's a question for the calendar. The DOAH hearing is next Thursday, so, of course, that day is not available. And it would depend on your personal calendars. As far as Staff's concerned, I mean, we can deal with that.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Is it free on the Commission calendar?

MR. TUDOR: Well, next Tuesday there's --

Clark, Deason and Jacobs are on a 9:30 TECO hearing. 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: There you go. 3 a day. MR. TUDOR: TECO doing business as Peoples 4 Gas System. I'm not sure what that case is. 5 It's under the rider. 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: MR. ELIAS: It's the FTA 2 tariff. And 7 we're fairly close to a settlement proposal that Staff 8 can recommend approval of. We're working on that as 9 we speak. So I don't anticipate that that hearing 10 would take very much time. 11 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we continue this 12 item so that we don't have to renotice it? Can we 13 continue it until next Tuesday at 9:00 o'clock or 14 8:30? 15 16 MR. ELIAS: Yes. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I 17 propose we do that. Because I don't think at this 18 point, given the offers and what we've talked about, 19 that we would find a majority position. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'll second that. 21 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Well, let me 22 23 express my concern that I don't think that's what we 24 should do. But there's a majority, there's been a

motion and a second. I do have one question.

25

Are we delaying this with the intent that 1 we're instructing Staff to negotiate with the parties 2 3 or are we just getting more time to make a decision 4 based upon the proposals in front of us? 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No. I would give it a week's time for the parties to come back with a 6 7 proposal. I would suppose that the proposal needs to be -- each proposal needs to be submitted by close of 9 business Friday. And then Staff will make a recommendation, hopefully Monday, or orally make a 10 11 recommendation. It would be helpful to have the same 12 kind of matrix you put out, maybe Monday, and we'll make a decision on Tuesday. 13 COMMISSIONER DEASON: So we will be 14 continuing this on item of the agenda until August 15 22nd at the conclusion of the TECO hearing? 16 17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: February 22nd. 18 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Why am I saying August? I'm looking at the wrong side of the 19 20 calendar. February 22nd. I'm six months ahead or I don't know which. 21 behind. That is the motion and there's a 22 23 second. All in favor way say "aye." 24 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Aye. 25 COMMISSIONER JACOBS:

1	COMMISSIONER DEASON: All opposed say "nay.'
2	Thank you all.
3	(Hearing recessed at 12:03 and reconvened at
4	1 p.m.)
5	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Martha, you wanted to add
6	something to Item 4?
7	MS. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We're back
8	here on Item 4 just briefly to ask the panel to set a
9	time certain for us to come back after we receive the
10	other proposals. We set it for the conclusion of the
11	TECO hearing. We have to hire interpreters and we
12	need to tell them exactly when to come. We'll inform
13	the parties as soon as you make that decision.
14	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioners, what's
15	your pleasure?
16	COMMISSIONER CLARK: What time did you
17	MS. BROWN: 8:30 or 9:00 in the morning.
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: 8:30 is fine with me.
19	COMMISSIONER DEASON: 8:30. Is that going
20	to be enough they are going to fly someone in the
21	night before?
22	MS. BROWN: Probably, yes.
23	COMMISSIONER DEASON: So 8:30 would be fine
24	then.
25	MS. BROWN: Probably, yes.

```
(Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
 2
    1:10 p.m.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA:
4	COUNTY OF LEON:
5	I, JOY KELLY, RPR, do hereby certify that the
6	foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the
7	time and place therein designated; that my shorthand
8	notes were translated by me; and the foregoing pages
9	numbered 3 through 68 are a true andcorrect record of the
10	aforesaid proceedings.
11	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
12	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties,
13	nor relative or employee of such attorney or counsel,
14	or financially interested in the foregoing action.
15	DATED this 21st, day of February, 2000.
16	
17	
18	
19	JOY KELLY, RPR
20	100 SALEM COURT TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
21	(850) 878-2221
22	
23	
24	

Docke	t 991222-TP 2-15-00 Agenda Item #4	_
S	9	
\$300,000 16/5, 16/8	991222-TP 1/3	4
	9:00 61/14, 63/17 9:30 61/1	
*	9th 48/4, 48/9, 49/10, 49/19, 50/1, 50/20, 51/7	
* 1/10, 1/11, 1/12 ********************************		1
*** 1/9, 1/13	A	1
	A.24 48/5 a.m 1/19	72
1	ability 54/18	ľ
1 30/19, 31/21, 31/22, 36/15, 50/1, 63/4 10 6/15, 7/14	absolute 20/11 absorbs 30/13	1:
100,000 20/7	accept 16/7, 16/24, 21/6, 26/18, 38/17, 39/17,	1:
10:30 1/19 11 6/16	54/18, 58/15 acceptable 24/8, 26/5	ŀ
11th 3/10	accepted 21/10, 39/10, 57/23	ľ
12 6/19, 7/14, 31/9, 31/10	accepting 38/25, 40/13 Access 1/7	H
120.57 36/4, 37/4 12:03 63/3	accomplished 40/2	
148 1/21	accurate 11/14 Act 1/8, 18/17, 43/18	;
14th 3/13 15 1/18	acted 18/9, 18/23, 25/22, 42/2, 44/7	ŀ
15th 13/4, 13/9, 47/10, 58/8	action 52/22	
1991 1/8 1:10 1/20, 64/2	activity 3/16, 55/25 add 24/21, 55/13, 63/5	
1st 3/21, 4/25, 5/3, 5/9, 6/18, 12/3, 13/18, 17/8	added 26/19	
	address 10/8, 15/15, 16/10, 17/15, 25/5, 27/9, 41/10, 42/6, 44/20	Įi
2	addressed 17/5	li
2 61/7	addressing 14/19, 22/18 Administrative 12/8, 17/12, 18/19	Į1
2.5 6/17 2000 1/5, 1/18, 5/9, 9/6	advanced 47/20	ľ
2001 31/22, 32/13	advantage 20/17, 20/22 affairs 58/14	li
2002 32/13 22nd 62/16, 62/17, 62/20	agency 55/15	
24th 3/14, 4/12	AGENDA 1/14, 3/2, 25/1, 60/16, 60/17, 62/15 aggressively 15/6	1
250,000 7/14	agree 18/12, 19/25, 20/15, 25/20, 41/4, 43/10,	H
3	46/19, 47/4, 47/16, 48/2, 48/4, 50/12, 50/19, 51/3, 51/14, 54/19, 55/6, 56/17	H
	agreed 20/19, 43/9	ľ
3 65/9 300,000 8/8, 9/2	agreement 9/4, 21/21, 30/25, 31/21, 32/10, 41/6, 48/19, 49/4, 49/5, 53/6, 56/20	H
31st 3/17, 4/4, 9/6	agrees 41/24	
	air 50/17 ALJ 36/18, 41/24	li
4	allow 29/1, 38/12	l
4 1/14, 3/3, 63/6, 63/8 4075 1/22	allowance 39/15 allowed 4/13	li
45 60/11	alternatives 57/8	ľ
4th 49/18	amenable	ľ
5	amount 27/20, 40/20, 40/22, 40/23	H
	analysis 56/16, 56/24 andcorrect 65/9	Įί
500,000 7/12	Andrew 9/22	
6	answer 9/14, 10/3, 19/4, 26/6, 53/16 anticipate 61/10	١i
6 31/16, 33/10, 33/13, 33/18	apologize 51/16	li
6-cent 31/23, 32/12, 33/14	appeal 4/18, 14/15, 35/22, 35/24, 36/15, 37/3, 57/11	Ľ
60 5/22, 5/23, 6/8, 6/24, 7/3, 46/22, 46/23, 47/20, 47/22, 48/8, 48/21, 48/22, 50/4, 50/8, 50/14, 50/15.	appealed 36/11	
51/23, 51/24, 52/2, 53/5, 53/12, 53/14	applied 31/24, 32/6, 32/9, 32/19 apply 32/21	h
60-day 46/19 66 31/22, 32/14	applying 33/2	ŀ
68 65/9	appreciate 47/5 approach 58/19	ľ
69 6/4, 23/7	appropriate 54/6	Ŀ
7	approval 61/9 approve 34/24, 36/20	ľ
71.5 6/8	approving 44/14 arbitrarily 18/9, 18/17, 18/20, 19/12, 25/23, 42/2,	ľ
71.5 6/8 72 31/23, 32/23, 33/13, 44/17	43/18, 44/7	ŀ
72-cent 33/6	arbitrary 41/25 argument 26/15	Ľ
79 6/18, 6/19, 31/10, 32/3, 33/11, 33/19 7th 49/18, 49/20	arguments 25/10, 26/25	13
	arrangement 38/3 aspect 43/19	3
8	assist 27/15	4
80 30/20, 34/8, 34/12, 34/13, 34/17	assistance 29/3 associated 49/2	3
82.5 6/18 85 6/10, 6/13, 6/17, 6/20, 31/12, 31/24, 32/11,	assumptions 17/10	١,
33/9, 33/10, 33/19	assure 22/23, 24/1 AT&T 2/12, 2/13, 3/13, 4/1, 5/11, 5/22, 6/22,	3
8:30 61/15, 63/17, 63/18, 63/19, 63/23 8th	7/16, 8/18, 9/10, 14/1, 14/19, 14/20, 14/24, 15/12,	١,
	16/5, 17/5, 18/5, 18/21, 20/15, 20/21, 21/2, 21/14, 21/17, 22/8, 22/10, 22/21, 23/4, 23/16, 24/4, 24/12,	0

21/17, 22/8, 22/10, 22/21, 23/4, 23/16, 24/4, 24/12, 25/4, 25/8, 25/18, 25/19, 28/18, 42/16, 43/7, 43/13,

43/17, 44/5, 45/7, 46/14, 46/19, 47/16, 47/25, 48/4,

/12, 48/14, 49/1, 50/23, 51/1, 51/14, 55/17, 56/2. C&T's 6/3, 15/4, 18/10, 18/11, 19/4, 19/18, /24, 22/16, 23/12, 23/20, 24/2, 25/14, 26/23, 29/8, /3, 47/14, 49/16 ached 49/15 tempting 49/11 torney 22/18, 27/13, 65/12, 65/13 trition 29/16 igust 62/15, 62/19 isley 9/24 thor 51/19 thority 54/23, 57/18 tomatically 46/8 aliable 3/5, 26/13, 55/19, 60/20 enue 26/13 oid 12/1, 19/1, 22/3 oidance 10/14 ard 3/11, 23/13, 37/5, 37/6, 45/2, 54/5, 55/8, 14, 56/25 arded 5/24, 21/15, 21/25, 22/5, 30/8, 37/25, arding 19/2, 37/22 e 62/23, 62/24, 62/25

B

cked 23/12 ckground 3/9, 19/9 ed 10/16, 11/9, 11/11, 21/23, 30/11, 33/15, 7, 62/4 sing 21/2 sis 13/12, 18/23, 19/11, 28/22, 30/9, 33/8, 58/3, ar 43/21 tty 1/21 i 4/1, 9/25, 10/7, 10/10, 10/20, 18/7, 18/25, 18, 21/2, 25/6, 25/14, 25/25, 26/5, 26/11, 28/16, 20, 39/13, 43/16, 44/15 lders 3/7, 5/8, 8/11 lders' 3/8 ls 37/6, 39/15, 40/6 led 33/12 32/16 B 2/5 ttom 4/20, 49/9, 50/1, 50/13 ught 33/1, 33/3 eak 24/22, 24/24, 53/19, 60/12 eakdown 14/12 eathe 58/18 enneman 9/22 ef 10/1, 17/22, 25/4 ng 3/10 inging 31/3 ought 9/24 OWN 2/4 ld 23/14 den 19/20 dened 10/22 siness 11/9, 12/23, 13/6, 15/3, 15/14, 16/15, 3, 41/21, 61/4, 62/9 inessman 21/19

endar 60/19, 60/24, 62/20 endars 60/21 ll 3/2, 25/1, 29/14 ls 16/12, 28/9, 29/12, 29/15 ne 21/15 ncel 5/21, 7/3, 48/6, 51/22, 52/17, 53/6, 53/9, ncellation 48/16, 49/24, 50/25 icelled 6/24, 52/14 8/2, 8/7, 9/1, 16/7, 20/16 ital 23/13 ped 16/5, 16/6 ping 16/6 ricious 41/25 oriciously 18/9, 18/17, 18/21, 19/13, 25/23, 2, 43/18, 44/7 otured 10/12, 41/20 re 27/24 reful 15/21 rtier 27/21, 42/8 rier's 59/19 carries 20/4 carry 4/14, 34/4 case 12/7, 17/12, 19/6, 19/22, 19/23, 25/21, 26/3, 37/3, 61/5 case-by-case 28/22

cases 19/15, 19/17 caused 7/24 causes 42/18 caveat 6/23 cent 17/3 Center 1/21, 8/13, 8/21, 8/25, 23/14, 23/22, 29/13, 29/14, 29/15, 30/14, 30/18, 34/1, 34/11, 37/15 cents 6/4, 6/8, 6/10, 6/13, 6/17, 6/18, 6/20, 23/7, 31/10, 31/16, 31/23, 31/25, 32/3, 32/11, 32/14, 32/24, 32/25, 33/7, 33/9, 33/10, 33/11, 33/13, 33/18 CERTIFICATE 65/1 certified 48/8 certify 65/5, 65/11 chair 19/18 Chairman 47/1, 63/5 change 16/15, 21/12, 39/15, 39/17, 47/7, 49/12 changing 44/1, 54/13 charge 6/7, 7/6, 7/10, 7/15, 37/19, 50/16, 53/7 charges 6/21, 6/22, 7/12, 35/2, 35/4, 35/8, 39/4, 40/14, 40/17, 41/5, 41/8, 41/13, 43/9, 46/25, 49/6, 50/8, 52/5, 52/9 CHARLES 2/8, 9/18 chart 3/7, 49/16 choice 52/18 choices 37/2 chose 57/14 chosen 43/12, 43/15 CINDY 2/6, 39/20, 54/16 Circuit 18/3 circumstances 39/25, 40/4, 40/10 cite 39/23 citizens 24/15, 24/16 clarification 54/12 clarifications 54/15 clarified 49/8 clarify 30/15, 32/16, 36/4, 47/13, 47/15, 48/13 CLARK 1/16, 21/6, 24/5, 24/10, 34/23, 39/12, 40/11, 40/18, 41/22, 42/5, 43/14, 43/24, 44/12, 45/2, 45/8, 45/19, 49/13, 51/24, 52/7, 53/16, 53/23, 54/16, 55/5, 55/18, 57/24, 58/9, 58/20, 59/8, 59/15, 59/23, 60/13, 61/1, 61/2, 61/6, 61/12, 61/17, 62/5, 62/17, 62/24, 63/16, 63/18 clause 7/21, 8/22, 17/1, 49/24 clear 19/22, 21/24, 37/24 close 61/8, 62/8 closing 24/11 collusion 19/1, 19/6 Colorado 30/11 Commenced 1/19 Commenced 1/17
comments 22/19, 25/7
COMMISSION 1/1, 10/19, 11/12, 11/24, 13/5, 13/14, 13/19, 14/14, 14/23, 15/9, 15/16, 15/20, 18/9, 18/11, 18/17, 18/22, 20/6, 20/10, 25/22, 28/4, 37/21, 18/11, 18/17, 18/22, 20/6, 20/10, 25/22, 26/4, 5//4 42/6, 42/12, 44/7, 46/21, 48/18, 50/24, 60/24 Commission's 12/10, 12/13, 13/23, 18/20 COMMISSIONER 1/16, 1/17, 3/2, 9/16, 17/19, 21/6, 22/6, 22/9, 22/13, 24/5, 24/10, 24/20, 25/1, 27/4, 30/3, 30/5, 31/1, 31/6, 31/18, 32/1, 33/18, 33/21, 33/24, 34/10, 34/15, 34/20, 34/21, 34/23, 35/1, 35/3, 35/5, 36/3, 36/8, 36/13, 37/8, 37/17, 37/18, 38/4, 38/7, 39/2, 39/9, 39/12, 39/18, 40/11, 40/15, 40/18, 40/21, 41/11, 41/17, 41/19, 41/22, 42/5, 42/18, 43/14, 43/23, 43/24, 44/4, 44/12, 44/22, 42/5, 42/18, 43/14, 43/23, 43/24, 44/4, 44/12, 44/22, 45/2, 45/4, 45/8, 45/10, 45/19, 46/2, 46/11, 46/13, 47/5, 47/12, 47/24, 48/18, 49/3, 49/13, 49/25, 50/3, 50/7, 50/10, 51/24, 52/7, 52/16, 52/24, 53/16, 53/18, 53/21, 53/23, 54/9, 54/16, 54/25, 55/2, 55/5, 55/18, 56/5, 56/6, 56/11, 57/20, 57/22, 57/24, 58/4, 58/6, 58/9, 58/10, 58/20, 59/8, 59/15, 59/23, 60/7, 60/13, 60/23, 61/2, 61/6, 61/12, 61/17, 61/21, 61/22, 62/5, 62/14, 62/17, 62/18, 62/26, 63/16, 63/14, 62/14, 62/17, 62/18, 62/24, 62/25, 63/1, 63/14, 63/16, 63/18, 63/19, 63/23 Commissioners 3/4, 9/17, 10/11, 17/13, 17/21, 19/3, 21/23, 27/5, 30/4, 32/15, 41/3, 47/1, 47/13, 53/18, 55/7, 56/6, 58/17, 60/7, 63/14 commitment 23/12 Communications 2/2, 9/19 community 11/19 companies 20/18, 22/4, 59/7, 59/12, 59/21 company 6/14, 9/19, 35/11, 38/13, 38/21, 38/22 company's 35/6 compares 26/23 comparison 3/7, 5/4, 5/7, 30/16 competition 40/3 competitive 23/1, 39/25 competitors 23/6 completed 38/16 compliance 1/7 complicate 29/4

complied 54/20

comply 24/2, 51/20 components 59/18 comprehensive 14/24 computates 35/12 concept 10/13 concern 12/13, 15/22, 35/5, 54/25, 55/2, 56/18, 61/23 concerned 11/19, 16/16, 35/1, 35/3, 60/22 concerns 45/8, 57/24 concession 21/17 conclude 53/20, 60/9, 60/14 Concluded 1/20, 13/17, 64/1 concludes 46/6 conclusion 62/16, 63/10 conditions 17/2 **CONFERENCE 1/14, 1/21** confident 12/9, 14/14 conflict 48/11, 50/22 consideration 10/7, 11/3, 11/11, 30/2, 54/24, 55/6, 57/5, 58/13, 59/1 considerations 29/24, 43/5 consistency 28/4 consistent 57/17 constraints 42/22 Consumer 23/20, 28/7 consumers 11/25, 23/10, 27/23 contact 10/4 contemplation 49/6 contend 14/22 continue 8/4, 28/20, 29/12, 29/21, 32/8, 42/9, 56/1, 57/14, 60/16, 61/12, 61/14 continues 28/19, 32/4, 32/6, 36/1 continuing 62/15 contract 3/12, 3/16, 3/17, 3/18, 3/22, 4/2, 5/11, 5/14, 5/16, 5/17, 5/18, 5/22, 5/25, 6/2, 6/12, 6/15, 6/24, 7/8, 7/9, 7/11, 7/19, 8/5, 9/5, 12/16, 13/20, 17/25, 18/1, 18/6, 19/8, 19/10, 20/14, 21/15, 21/16, 21/25, 22/5, 23/9, 23/14, 28/24, 29/1, 30/1, 30/8, 31/9, 31/11, 32/8, 32/14, 32/20, 32/23, 33/4, 33/16, 34/1, 34/3, 34/7, 35/13, 35/23, 36/6, 36/16, 37/6, 37/10, 37/22, 38/12, 38/13, 38/16, 38/23, 41/15, 45/3, 46/2, 46/16, 47/17, 47/19, 48/7, 48/15, 49/23, 50/21, 51/3, 51/15, 51/22, 51/25, 52/22, 53/9, 53/10, 54/5, 55/12, 57/3, 57/4, 57/13, 57/15 contracts 13/6, 19/2, 56/2 CONVENIENCE 1/11 convince 11/4 COPY 1/11 corporate 23/12 correct 25/21, 31/4, 31/5, 33/20, 34/19, 36/16, 39/3, 39/5, 39/6, 45/4, 46/12, 50/9, 52/10 cost 23/8, 35/14, 47/3 costing 11/9 costs 6/25, 30/13, 30/24, 35/17, 38/1, 38/19, 38/20, 40/19, 41/14 Counsel 2/6, 9/25, 25/8, 25/9, 65/12, 65/13 counterproposals 42/23 COUNTY 65/4 couple 4/8, 4/21, 21/24, 36/17 course 4/1, 4/17, 60/20 court 4/18, 18/3 cover 35/16 credit 6/16, 31/16, 31/19, 31/23, 31/24, 31/25, 32/3, 32/6, 32/8, 32/12, 32/24, 33/15 credits 32/19 crucial 10/7, 11/3 cuff 40/23 currently 3/22 customers 10/14, 10/25, 16/18, 17/9

D

damage 20/11, 21/18
damages 7/16, 7/18, 7/25, 8/5, 8/9, 8/22, 9/2,
12/14, 15/24, 16/4, 16/8, 16/25, 18/12, 19/25, 20/20,
24/3, 24/9, 25/20, 26/8, 43/10, 43/19, 44/21
damaging 16/8
DATE 1/18, 3/10, 3/19, 4/5, 13/4, 13/9
day 20/7, 59/11, 60/20, 61/3
days 5/22, 5/23, 6/24, 7/3, 46/22, 46/23, 47/20,
47/22, 48/8, 48/21, 48/22, 50/4, 50/8, 50/14, 50/15,
51/23, 51/24, 52/2, 53/5, 53/12, 53/14
deadline 47/9, 58/7, 60/4
deal 54/3, 60/22
DEASON 1/16, 3/2, 9/16, 17/19, 22/6, 22/9,
22/13, 24/20, 25/1, 27/4, 30/3, 33/18, 33/21, 34/21,
35/3, 37/8, 37/17, 38/4, 39/2, 41/11, 41/17, 41/19,
42/18, 43/23, 44/4, 44/22, 45/4, 45/10, 46/2, 46/11,
46/13, 47/5, 47/24, 48/18, 49/3, 49/25, 50/3, 50/7,
50/10, 52/16, 52/24, 53/18, 55/2, 56/6, 57/20, 58/6,
60/7, 61/1, 61/22, 62/14, 62/18, 63/1, 63/14, 63/19,

debate 44/22 debates 27/13 decide 52/1, 58/3 decided 16/15, 36/11 decides 35/21 decision 3/11, 4/15, 4/25, 13/5, 17/24, 18/20, 22/2, 36/5, 36/14, 36/18, 37/11, 38/11, 38/25, 42/20, 43/2, 43/6, 45/11, 45/13, 54/8, 56/7, 56/9, 56/25, 58/23, 60/8, 60/9, 62/3, 62/13, 63/13 decision-making 17/17 DECKER 2/13, 22/12, 22/15 declining 31/7 decrease 32/4 deep 39/20 defending 16/2 defined 7/2 degrade 16/14 delaying 62/1 demanded 20/18 demonstrate 47/3, 55/15 demonstrated 11/21 Denver 30/11 deny 24/16, 57/18 denying 24/15 Department 12/8, 17/12 depend 60/21 dependent 33/21 depends 11/20 described 22/1 description 9/12 designated 65/7 designed 34/11 desire 10/17, 16/14 desired 12/5, 13/15 despotically 18/23 detail 16/10 Detailed 19/10 determinations 36/24, 37/1 development 30/22, 41/21 dial 28/8 die 38/5 difference 7/21, 21/9, 33/19, 35/8, 56/18 differential 11/15 differentiated 7/7 differentiates 5/12 difficult 19/15, 31/12 Director 27/8, 27/12 disapprove 36/20 discharge 15/13 discharges 13/1 discomfort 42/19 discontinue 55/11 discretion 40/25 discussions 57/6 disqualify 25/18 disruption 10/14, 27/20, 27/25 disservice 24/19 distance 23/21, 26/20 Division 2/2, 2/4, 2/5, 9/23, 22/16, 23/20 DOAH 4/11, 4/15, 4/18, 5/15, 10/9, 12/12, 13/17, 14/2, 15/23, 16/3, 16/9, 17/15, 25/11, 25/12, 26/4, 35/21, 36/5, 36/14, 36/18, 37/20, 38/11, 38/25, 45/12, 46/1, 46/6, 46/17, 60/19 DOCKET 1/3 doesn't 20/8, 29/4, 33/17 dollars 16/7, 23/8, 23/9, 23/13, 29/21, 33/17, 36/1 DONNA 2/10, 27/6 drawing 57/25 duration 5/10, 33/22 during 6/6, 8/13, 23/3, 27/24, 30/1, 30/21, 30/23, 31/25, 33/8, 34/1, 34/3, 39/8

63/23

Deason's 54/25

E.

earn 11/6
easiest 15/16
Easley 1/21
easy 19/23
economic 30/22
effect 32/18, 39/14, 49/24
effective 6/17, 33/11
effort 5/2, 11/22
elected 28/4
ELECTRONIC 1/10
ELIAS 2/5
ELLIS 2/7, 9/21, 10/3, 30/10
emergency 3/23, 3/24, 39/22, 39/24, 40/2, 40/7, 42/10, 42/22, 54/21, 55/14, 55/15, 57/18
emphasize 12/11, 18/15

emphasized 24/6 employee 65/12, 65/13 employees 23/16 employment 29/22 end 18/6, 39/20, 53/7, 53/14 ends 28/25 enforcing 12/16 engaged 57/6 ensure 27/23 ensuring 24/13 enter 5/15, 39/24 entertain 42/23, 48/25 entertain 42/23, entity 16/15 equally 13/22 equating 23/7 Esplanade 1/22 establishing 36/6 establishment 33/25 evaluate 29/2, 45/6 evaluation 23/3, 44/13 event 31/8, 50/3, 57/13 exceed 40/19 exception 8/20 exceptions 4/14, 8/20 excluded 28/16 existing 39/7
exists 3/23, 3/24, 7/22
exit 10/25, 16/16 expect 4/15, 34/1 expecting 59/13 expenses 49/1 experiencing 22/25 expertise 10/10 expiration 4/4, 48/20, 48/23 expire 52/23 expires 3/17 explanation 26/1 explore 30/8 expose 35/19 expose 51/23 extend 4/3, 5/20, 5/21, 13/10, 29/12, 47/23 extendable 47/20 extending 13/8, 52/25, 56/2 extension 6/7, 15/19, 17/3, 27/16, 27/18, 27/19,

F

faced 10/20 facilitate 43/11 facility 30/25, 31/4, 34/2, 34/5, 34/18, 35/13, 35/14 facing 10/25, 11/12 fact 13/9, 21/2, 54/7, 57/9 factor 59/25 facts 20/3, 43/21, 54/8 factual 18/23, 19/10, 36/24 failed 16/5 failure 14/9, 14/12, 15/18 fair 11/6, 42/24, 47/6, 54/6 fall 38/8 fault 7/23 favor 62/23 favorably 26/23 FCC 20/7, 42/7 feature 28/5 features 28/6 February 1/18, 3/6, 4/12, 13/3, 47/10, 48/3, 48/9, 49/10, 49/18, 49/19, 50/1, 50/19, 51/7, 58/7, 62/17, 62/20 federal 12/1, 13/2 fee 30/7 fees 30/12, 35/18 fence 19/17 FENTON 2/16 file 3/14 filed 3/13 finalize 4/18, 36/16 find 10/18, 26/10, 61/20 fine 20/7, 63/18, 63/23 firm 9/24 fixed 41/14 flat 28/13 flat 28/13 flexibility 13/7, 29/11, 29/18, 48/19 FLORIDA 1/1, 1/7, 1/22, 10/25, 22/24, 23/10, 23/21, 23/25, 24/15, 24/17, 27/15, 27/24, 29/2, 29/13, 29/22, 30/14, 33/25, 34/4, 34/18, 39/8, 65/3 fly 63/20 follow 51/2 footing 21/14, 21/21 force 7/21 forced 26/10

form 36/19 formal 3/15 forum 18/18 found 31/12 FPSC 48/5 frame 4/13 frames 10/23, 32/19 fraud 19/1, 19/7 free 23/21, 26/20, 60/23 fresh 58/19 Friday 62/9 front 42/13, 43/3, 44/23, 45/5, 62/4 FTA 61/7 fun 19/18, 19/19 functionality 28/5 fundamental 11/9, 12/25 fungible 12/21 future 32/22

G

GARCIA 63/5
Gas 61/5
gather 5/6
gear 7/4, 35/12
gentlemen 27/20, 28/12
going-forward 33/8
Government 27/8
grant 46/15
granted 44/5
grounds 43/16
guarantee 16/24
guess 30/6, 31/8, 35/14, 39/18, 49/22
guidelines 42/7

half 17/3, 35/10, 35/16, 35/25

H

hammer 12/15 handle 34/12 handled 34/9 handling 25/9, 31/2 hands 45/9 happy 23/24, 25/24 hard 19/7, 19/10 Hearings 12/9 Hearings's 17/12 help 5/6 helpful 62/11 hesitant 35/19 high 13/22, 18/21, 18/24, 43/8, 56/21 higher 28/17, 29/8 highest 23/4, 25/16, 26/20 highlight 4/8, 4/21 hire 63/11 hired 25/8 history 11/2 hoe 55/16 hold 56/20 holding 20/12 hopeful 54/2 hour 54/1 hours 44/18, 58/22, 58/24

1

idea 35/12 illogicaily 18/23 imagine 38/21 impaired 1/6 implementation 1/6 impossible 19/20 in-state 8/12, 8/20, 8/25, 15/6, 15/8, 23/14, 30/16, 30/21, 31/3 inclination 10/24 increasing 14/13 incumbent 42/11 incur 12/2 incurred 7/1, 38/2, 38/20 indented 51/9 indicated 8/11, 9/1, 10/24, 35/2, 45/12 indicates 15/11 indication 15/4 indulgence 17/14 industry 23/1, 23/23, 24/14, 37/15 inform 63/12 initial 9/5, 56/14, 57/19 inquiry 51/14 institute 26/11 instructing 62/2

intent 3/11, 3/13, 24/2, 25/5, 41/6, 53/14, 62/1
interim 3/6, 3/8, 3/25, 5/11, 5/17, 6/12, 6/15,
6/24, 7/13, 7/17, 8/1, 8/7, 8/13, 9/8, 9/12, 10/5,
11/22, 12/17, 13/12, 13/15, 13/21, 16/19, 17/18,
17/24, 19/9, 22/4, 22/21, 24/4, 24/12, 27/16, 27/24,
28/25, 29/3, 29/8, 29/20, 30/1, 30/17, 30/21, 30/23,
31/9, 31/15, 31/20, 32/10, 32/20, 33/9, 33/16, 33/22,
34/1, 34/3, 34/13, 34/16, 37/9, 38/13, 38/16, 38/21,
39/8, 39/13, 41/6, 42/12, 44/5, 44/9, 44/24, 45/6,
45/7, 45/16, 45/21, 45/24, 46/3, 46/6, 46/15, 47/16,
47/19, 49/23, 51/3, 51/14, 51/25, 53/5, 53/8, 55/3,
55/4, 55/20, 55/24, 56/20, 57/3, 57/13, 57/15
interject 14/6
internally 23/19
INTERPRETER 2/16, 53/19, 56/9, 58/24, 58/25,
60/10
interpreters 63/11
invest 23/12
investment 11/7
issue 7/5, 15/24, 18/7, 25/6, 32/11, 33/25, 36/21,
43/22, 44/18
issued 3/11
issues 22/18
ITEM 1/14, 3/3, 6/22, 34/25, 60/17, 61/13, 62/15,
63/6, 63/8

JACOBS 1/17, 30/5, 31/1, 31/6, 31/18, 32/1, 33/24, 34/10, 34/15, 34/20, 35/1, 35/5, 36/8, 36/13, 37/18, 38/7, 39/9, 39/18, 40/11, 40/15, 40/21, 53/21, 54/9, 56/5, 56/11, 57/22, 58/4, 58/10, 60/23, 61/1, 61/21, 62/25

January 3/10, 3/13, 3/14

JENNIFER 2/11, 27/7

joined 22/17

JOY 1/24, 65/5

Judge 18/19, 35/21

judge's 36/24

juncture 10/13

June 1/5, 3/21, 4/25, 5/3, 5/9, 6/18, 12/3, 13/18, 14/2, 17/8, 30/19, 31/21, 31/22, 36/15

K

KELLY 1/24, 65/5 key 20/11, 21/9 keystone 17/16, 17/17 KING 2/2 knock 15/21 known 43/19

L

labeled 42/21 lack 38/6 laid 4/10 language 21/4, 21/7, 21/10, 40/1, 48/1 lasts 31/9 later 52/13 latest 55/20 latitude 47/7, 47/8 LAURA 2/2 law 3/20, 10/10, 12/1, 12/9, 18/19, 18/22, 18/25, 26/6, 36/4, 54/20 lawsuits 18/3 lawyer 21/19 lead 12/22 leapfrogging 22/3 learning 28/8 lease 38/2 leasehold 30/24 leave 43/25 leaves 60/10 leeway 13/10 Legal 2/4, 2/5, 13/23, 16/9, 17/11, 22/18, 26/24, 27/13, 36/1, 37/1 lend 12/20 length 31/20, 47/18 LEON 1/17, 65/4 letter 46/20, 47/16, 48/4, 48/9, 48/10, 48/12, 49/10, 49/11, 49/14, 49/21, 50/1, 50/20, 51/7, 51/17, level 16/20, 16/24 levels 16/17 Hability 11/16, 14/21, 20/16, 21/5, 35/20, 37/23 liable 7/24 liberty 39/14 life 23/9 likelihood 7/2, 13/17, 14/13, 18/4, 44/14

limitation 21/4 Limited 9/19, 36/23, 47/19 limits 36/25 line 4/7, 4/9, 38/8, 59/3, 59/4, 59/5, 59/6, 59/7 lines 51/13 Liquidated 7/16, 7/18, 7/24, 8/5, 8/9, 8/22, 9/2, 12/14, 15/24, 16/4, 16/25, 18/12, 19/25, 20/10, 20/20, 21/18, 24/2, 24/9, 25/20, 26/7, 43/10, 43/19, liquidation 38/17, 39/1 listen 17/14 litigation 38/22 little 3/9, 8/17, 32/16, 56/3 lose 58/6 losing 56/9 love 26/16 low 18/4 lower 14/20, 16/20, 16/24, 17/4, 20/23, 40/23, 46/9 lowest 25/15, 43/8

M

mail 48/8

majeure 7/21

majority 60/6, 61/20, 61/24 Manager 9/22, 22/16, 30/11 manages 29/14 mandatory 3/20 manner 20/8, 20/13, 54/6 market 10/25, 16/16 Markets 23/20, 27/8 marks 23/4 MARSHA 2/12, 22/17, 25/3, 48/14, 54/17 MARTHA 2/4, 63/5 MARTIN 2/9, 9/24 Marty 17/14 material 12/14, 16/1, 20/1, 20/14, 20/24, 43/19 materiality 15/24, 20/6, 44/20 materials 49/17 matrix 62/12 Matter 1/3, 25/9, 27/9, 33/9, 33/17, 38/11 matters 1/6, 29/4 MCI 2/10, 2/11, 3/17, 4/1, 5/11, 5/22, 6/5, 7/6, 7/19, 8/4, 8/23, 8/24, 9/10, 10/24, 14/1, 14/18, 15/15, 16/4, 16/21, 27/6, 27/7, 28/12, 28/19, 29/10, 29/25, 42/7, 42/11, 42/14, 44/1, 55/24, 59/4 MCl's 7/18, 15/19, 15/22, 16/11, 17/5, 28/2, 29/7 McNULTY 2/10, 27/6 meet 11/25, 18/21, 18/25 mentioned 23/6 merit 36/14, 37/21, 57/11 merits 17/15, 18/4, 18/14, 19/22, 44/8, 44/12, 44/13 met 32/19 Miami 29/13, 30/19, 30/23 MIKE 2/7, 9/21, 30/10 mile 23/18 MILLER 2/6 million 16/7, 23/8, 23/9, 36/1 mind 11/18, 19/21, 38/10 minimal 41/9 minimizing 15/18 minimizing 5/10, 5/20, 37/14, 46/8, 46/14, 47/17, 47/21, 48/16, 48/25, 50/20, 51/4, 51/15, 52/12, 52/13, 52/19 minus 33/13 minute 6/3, 6/4, 6/9, 6/10, 6/13, 17/4, 23/7, 31/7, 31/10, 32/24 minutes 32/21, 32/25, 33/3, 33/7, 33/15, 57/7, mlstaken 31/6 misunderstanding 9/11, 24/18, 25/17, 26/9, 27/2 misunderstood 45/19 mitigated 38/20 mitigated 38/20 modification 43/4, 47/4 modifications 53/24 modified 56/17, 57/16, 57/19 modify 54/18, 56/15 modifying 49/3 moment 58/18 Monday 62/10, 62/10 monitoring 16/12, 17/1 month 4/16, 14/1, 14/2, 33/12, 51/25, 52/8, 53/5 months 5/11, 5/12, 6/16, 6/19, 7/14, 15/9, 18/6, 21/24, 22/4, 23/22, 28/3, 31/9, 31/10, 32/22, 33/4, 35/9, 35/10, 35/16, 35/22, 36/2, 37/14, 45/14, 45/16, 45/23, 46/3, 46/15, 46/16, 47/17, 47/21, 48/20, 48/23, 50/21, 51/4, 51/15, 52/3, 52/5, 52/12, 52/14, 52/17, 52/23, 52/25, 53/2, 53/8, 53/9, 62/20 morning 3/4, 22/11, 22/17, 27/5, 27/11, 63/17 Motion 34/22, 38/5, 38/9, 39/11, 53/21, 57/20,

57/23, 58/4, 58/12, 60/5, 61/25, 62/22 move 34/24 Mr. Brenneman 10/2 Mr. Chairman 34/23, 61/17, 63/7 Mr. Commissioner 37/13 MR. ELIAS 61/7, 61/16 Mr. Ellis 10/3, 30/10, 31/5, 31/15, 31/19, 32/10, 34/6, 34/11, 34/19, 37/13, 41/3, 41/14, 41/18, 41/20 Mr. Rehwinkel 9/16, 9/17, 17/23, 22/1, 37/18, 45/23, 46/5, 46/12, 46/18, 47/11, 48/3, 49/20, 55/7 Mr. Sipple 10/8, 13/16, 16/9, 17/21, 21/8, 25/13, 25/19, 25/21 MR. TUDOR 3/4, 32/15, 33/20, 33/23, 47/13, 48/2, 48/9, 48/10, 49/15, 50/12, 51/5, 51/7, 51/9 51/12, 52/11, 53/3, 54/12, 55/21, 60/18, 60/25, 61/4 Mr. Tudor's 11/13, 30/15 MS. BROWN 36/3, 36/9, 36/17, 39/19, 41/1, 42/4, 54/22, 55/13, 63/7, 63/17, 63/22, 63/25 MS. DECKER 22/11, 22/15, 24/6, 24/11, 39/3, 39/6, 48/9, 48/24, 49/10, 52/6, 52/10 Ms. McNulty 22/6, 22/8, 27/4, 27/5 Ms. Rule 24/20, 25/2, 25/3, 48/14, 49/9, 49/22, 50/2, 50/6, 50/9, 51/5, 51/8, 51/11, 51/16, 52/21, 53/1, 53/12, 53/17 MS. SPADE 27/11, 42/6, 59/2, 59/10, 59/17 mutually 24/8

N

name 9/18, 22/13 nation 28/20 National 30/11 nature 58/14 nav 63/1 necessary 41/5 need 4/24, 4/25, 5/2, 7/4, 11/18, 11/25, 12/16, 13/6, 13/20, 15/2, 41/1, 41/7, 42/20, 43/2, 43/6, 13/0, 13/20, 13/2, 41/1, 41/7, 42/20, 43/2, 43/6, 43/24, 44/15, 44/25, 45/6, 47/25, 49/1, 49/7, 53/19, 54/10, 54/12, 55/20, 56/7, 56/8, 60/9, 60/10, 63/12 needs 53/19, 62/7, 62/8 negotiate 24/7, 40/9, 42/13, 42/24, 62/2 negotiated 15/1 negotiating 42/20, 57/25 negotiation 39/25 negotiations 55/11, 59/24 neither 20/4 net 12/7 new 23/22 night 63/21 nine 7/13, 35/9, 35/10 non-recoverable 7/1 non-scored 21/3 noon 56/10 normal 29/16, 40/6 notes 65/8 notice 3/13, 5/21, 5/22, 6/1, 6/25, 7/3, 11/14, 11/16, 46/22, 46/23, 47/22, 48/8, 48/21, 48/22, 50/5, 50/8, 50/14, 50/15, 51/23, 52/2, 52/18, 53/2, 53/6, 53/9, 53/13 number 53/24 numbered 65/9

O

obligated 55/11 obligation 13/2, 21/12, 53/10 obtained 20/21 odds 27/2 offer 5/19, 9/8, 22/22, 23/1, 23/11, 23/23, 24/14, 25/18, 27/17, 27/18, 29/3, 29/5, 31/10, 38/7, 39/17, 47/2, 47/6, 54/18, 55/19, 55/24, 56/15, 56/16, 57/16 offered 7/16, 23/6, 27/17, 42/11 offering 23/21, 30/17, 30/22 offers 27/19, 31/16, 45/5, 61/19 Office 2/6 officer 36/5, 37/20 OFFICIAL 1/11 one-hour 59/6 one-month 53/8 open 23/22, 44/17 operate 5/17, 6/12, 7/17, 8/8, 8/19, 8/21, 8/24, 8/25, 29/13 operated 6/20 operating 8/4, 8/23, 35/15 operators 29/23 opinion 25/12, 41/9, 43/7, 44/6, 44/10, 45/7, 57/17 opportunities 44/20 opportunity 13/11, 13/19, 24/23, 27/1, 28/21, 42/15, 42/17, 44/17, 53/25, 55/1, 57/1 opposed 6/7, 35/9, 38/25, 63/1 opposite 57/7, 57/9

option 5/19, 12/4, 42/3
optional 21/3
options 37/7
oral 26/15
orally 62/10
order 3/3, 21/18, 25/2, 36/20, 36/21, 36/22, 42/10
ordered 4/13
organized 23/20
original 34/6, 56/25, 57/21, 57/23, 58/16
outcome 10/6, 12/12
outset 10/11
outsource 23/18
outstanding 23/11
owns 23/16

P

p.m 1/20, 63/4, 64/2 package 49/15 pages 65/8 panel 60/6, 63/8 paragraph 50/18 part 21/3, 34/6, 48/7, 58/25, 59/15, 59/23 participants 47/7 participate 55/1 PARTICIPATING 2/1 parties 9/14, 54/25, 56/14, 62/2, 62/6, 63/13, 65/12 Partnership 9/20 party 14/4, 52/23, 57/2, 57/3, 57/4, 58/1, 60/3 path 27/19, 29/9 paying 32/13 payment 38/2 penalty 11/16 Peoples 61/4 percentage 30/20 period 4/10, 4/23, 5/20, 6/6, 6/9, 6/15, 7/11, 8/13, 9/5, 14/6, 26/15, 27/16, 27/22, 27/25, 29/3, 30/21, 30/23, 31/19, 33/9, 33/22, 34/13, 39/8, 45/11, 52/19, 53/9, 58/2 periods 8/6, 13/8
permanent 3/16, 4/2, 5/16, 5/18, 5/24, 5/25, 6/1, 6/5, 6/14, 7/8, 7/9, 7/11, 8/3, 8/10, 8/19, 11/21, 12/18, 13/19, 15/10, 15/11, 15/13, 16/6, 16/23, 17/4, 18/1, 19/8, 23/13, 30/8, 31/11, 32/8, 32/18, 32/23, 33/4, 33/13, 34/7, 36/6, 37/22, 38/14, 38/23, 43/12, 43/15, 45/3, 45/22, 46/7, 46/9, 52/1, 55/9, 57/1, 57/4 permit 40/1 personal 43/7, 60/21 personally 54/4 personnel 12/23 perspective 10/9 persuaded 35/18, 56/20 phase 34/2 phrased 54/22 PLACE 1/21, 6/15, 12/3, 15/5, 19/19, 40/8, 41/7, 55/25, 57/15, 65/7 plan 16/16, 30/18 playing 43/6 pleasure 56/7, 63/15 Plus 16/11 point 3/18, 12/11, 14/8, 15/18, 23/15, 28/11, 29/10, 32/17, 36/18, 37/1, 41/2, 45/9, 51/6, 59/9, 60/2, 60/8, 61/19 points 14/7, 14/8 position 11/25, 13/24, 16/3, 16/9, 16/23, 17/11, 19/24, 21/17, 24/8, 49/12, 51/18, 61/20 positioning 59/21 positions 20/4 possibilities 15/18 possibility 46/24 possible 29/16 postpone 56/8 posture 26/10, 56/3 potential 14/9 practices 40/6 preceding 50/23 predict 4/17 PREFILED 1/12 premise 17/24 premised 22/2, 22/3 premised 2/2, 22/3 prepare 4/24 prepared 5/3, 15/12, 26/22, 45/14, 57/16 preparing 12/22 presentation 11/13 pressure 13/5, 59/6 pretty 19/22, 21/24, 36/23 prevail 13/24, 14/15, 19/4, 45/15 prevailing 14/4 prevails 37/10, 46/11, 46/17 price 11/15, 14/20, 20/23, 23/2, 23/7, 24/14, 25/15, 26/19, 28/17, 31/7, 31/22, 31/24, 43/5, 46/9,

56/18, 56/20 primary 10/4 principles 11/9 priority 56/21 private 20/9, 20/12 probability 13/23, 41/8 problem 7/22 proceed 17/19 proceeding 10/9, 13/17 PROCEEDINGS 1/14, 65/6, 65/10 process 5/15, 10/13, 10/22, 11/7, 12/13, 12/20, 15/14, 16/23, 23/4, 28/8, 28/17, 36/1, 36/6, 38/10, 38/15, 38/24, 40/16, 43/1, 44/16, 46/1, 46/6, 54/4 processes 54/21 procurement 3/24, 10/10, 10/16, 26/6, 26/13, 39/22, 39/24, 40/2, 40/6 product 23/17 proof 19/21 proposal 4/3, 6/5, 6/11, 7/17, 8/1, 8/2, 8/3, 8/10, 8/19, 9/12, 10/5, 11/14, 11/21, 11/22, 14/19, 14/20, 14/24, 14/25, 15/5, 15/19, 15/22, 16/6, 16/11, 17/3, 17/4, 17/6, 17/7, 18/10, 18/11, 21/3, 23/5, 25/14, 26/20, 28/23, 30/18, 31/15, 34/7, 39/3, 40/13, 44/8, 44/10, 45/22, 46/13, 47/8, 47/10, 47/14, 47/21, 49/16, 55/4, 58/3, 58/7, 58/12, 58/23, 59/13, 59/19, 60/3, 61/8, 62/7, 62/8 proposals 1/4, 3/6, 3/8, 3/25, 9/9, 11/11, 13/22, 14/22, 17/5, 19/8, 39/13, 43/3, 44/9, 54/14, 62/4, 63/10 propose 8/2, 20/22, 30/7, 60/1, 61/18 proposed 5/8, 6/5, 6/6, 6/22, 7/6, 7/7, 8/15, 11/8, 16/4, 21/4, 36/19, 36/22 proposes 8/8, 50/24 proposing 11/17, 16/22 protect 11/25 protest 3/14, 3/15, 4/10, 4/11, 4/16, 4/18, 4/19, 9/25, 10/7, 10/21, 12/7, 12/10, 14/2, 14/15, 17/15, 18/7, 18/25, 19/18, 21/2, 25/6, 26/11, 29/2, 37/10, 37/11, 43/16, 44/3, 44/16, 45/1, 45/20, 55/3, 55/8, 55/10, 55/14, 57/25 protester 19/16 prove 44/15 provide 3/23, 4/24, 5/3, 7/13, 8/12, 10/17, 11/6, 11/23, 20/8, 28/19, 29/21, 37/12, 39/14, 42/9, 45/14, 48/21, 48/22 provider 3/21, 4/3, 5/13, 6/14, 11/12, 11/23, 12/2, 12/17, 12/18, 13/12, 14/16, 17/8, 17/18, 18/1, 22/21, 24/4, 24/12, 25/15, 28/6, 28/15, 29/18, 43/12, 43/15, 45/17, 45/24, 46/6, 46/7, 48/7 providers 5/4, 5/19, 11/17, 12/21, 13/21, 14/6, 15/17, 55/22 provides 36/4, 39/23, 43/4 provision 5/21, 7/18, 7/19, 7/22, 8/5, 8/9, 8/14, 9/3, 9/7, 12/14, 13/13, 16/1, 18/12, 20/1, 20/11, 20/14, 20/20, 20/24, 21/18, 21/22, 39/1, 48/17, 51/21 provisioning 57/1 provisions 8/16, 13/21, 26/16, 46/10 prudent 40/3, 56/21 prudent 40/3, 56/21 PSC 9/3, 21/16, 29/2, 51/21 PSC's 21/11 PUBLIC 1/1 purchased 32/22, 33/8, 33/16 purpose 18/25, 22/20 pursue 37/3, 37/5 pursuing 15/6 pushing 59/12 put 9/1, 13/5, 13/13, 15/5, 25/9, 25/10, 26/19, 27/14, 41/7, 44/18, 49/20, 62/12 putting 59/6, 60/4

Q

qualifiers 17/2 quality 25/16, 43/4, 43/8 question 25/22, 26/3, 26/7, 30/5, 31/8, 34/15, 37/8, 37/19, 41/22, 42/1, 52/3, 52/11, 53/3, 53/7, 54/22, 55/18, 60/13, 60/18, 61/25 questioning 59/11, 59/17 questions 9/14, 10/3, 16/10, 27/10, 30/3, 34/21 quote 50/18, 50/23, 51/9

R

raised 25/7
raises 52/11
range 6/19
ranked 25/15, 26/21
ranking 23/5
rate 6/4, 6/11, 6/17, 29/7, 31/10, 31/11, 32/18, 32/23, 33/6, 33/11, 33/12, 43/8
rates 6/3

rationale 35/6, 35/11 reach 24/8 read 40/1, 47/14, 47/20, 51/17, 52/15, 52/20, 52/22 reading 48/11, 49/25, 51/6 realm 26/5 REALTIME 1/24 reason 13/3, 13/25, 18/1, 18/10, 41/15, 42/21, 43/22 reasonable 8/14, 27/17 reasoning 19/11 reasons 22/1, 25/23 rebate 33/1 rebid 57/10, 57/12 rebidding 42/3 rec 46/21 rec 46/21 recall 3/10 receive 7/8, 7/9, 7/10, 37/9, 63/9 received 23/4 receives 38/22 recess 24/23 recessed 63/3 recommend 61/9 recommendation 3/5, 4/7, 10/2, 34/24, 56/14, 57/19, 58/16, 62/10, 62/11 recommended 4/13, 25/18, 36/19 reconvened 63/3 record 65/9 recover 6/25, 35/14, 49/1 reduced 33/6 reed 21/1 reflective 32/3, 44/6 refund 33/14 refusal 19/25 refuse 26/7 refused 20/15, 25/20 refusing 20/21 Rehwinkel 9/18 REHWINKLE 2/8 reject 37/5 rejected 18/11 rejecting 18/10 relative 65/11, 65/13 relaxed 40/6 relay 1/4, 3/12, 9/22, 9/23, 10/17, 11/20, 14/9, 20/8, 22/16, 22/21, 22/23, 22/25, 23/21, 23/23, 24/13, 28/9, 28/13, 29/22 relief 30/20, 34/13, 34/16 relook 58/22 remains 38/15 remarks 10/1, 25/4 renotice 61/13 repeated 49/10 REPORTER 65/1 REPORTING 1/24 representatives 9/10 representing 9/19, 27/6 Request 1/4, 16/11, 47/20 requested 27/15 require 5/14 required 6/1, 8/25, 20/9, 21/9, 37/4, 37/15 requirement 7/20, 15/10, 15/25, 34/8, 50/25 requirements 12/1, 24/3, 30/17, 54/20 requires 15/9 resistance 27/19, 29/9 resolve 38/15 resolved 14/3 resort 42/8 respect 41/23, 43/17, 54/21 respond 25/6, 27/10, 37/19, 42/25, 59/22 response 22/22, 24/6, 26/1, 26/4, 26/17, 41/2, 51/13, 51/20 responses 26/5 responsive 26/3, 26/18 resubmit 58/3 resuit 25/12, 25/16, 36/14 return 11/6 returned 33/5 review 36/22, 36/25 RFP 7/20, 12/15, 15/25, 18/13, 20/16, 20/20, 21/3, 21/10, 22/23, 23/3, 24/3, 25/25, 26/17, 44/18, 44/19, 50/18, 50/24, 51/10, 53/13 RICHARD 2/2 rider 61/6 risk 41/9, 41/12, 41/17, 58/15 risks 11/12 road 55/16 Room 1/21 row 4/10 rows 4/21 RPR 1/24, 65/5 RULE 2/12, 22/17, 25/3, 39/23, 48/14, 54/17,

54/20, 57/18 rules 3/23, 37/20, 55/9 running 30/19

S

safety 12/7 Sales 9/23, 27/8, 27/12, 30/11 sanctions 12/1 satisfactory 9/4 satisfied 26/2 satisfy 19/20 savings 23/8, 23/10 scenario 14/17 schedule 26/15 scheduled 4/11 scope 36/25 seamless 11/23 second 4/10, 6/9, 15/15, 20/1, 38/5, 38/6, 57/23, 58/10, 61/21, 61/25, 62/23 second-guess 18/19 Section 36/4, 48/4 securing 30/13 select 13/11, 22/20 selected 5/13, 5/24, 6/14, 45/24, 45/25 selecting 12/17, 22/24, 24/3, 24/12 semantics 33/10 sense 14/1, 14/16, 54/7 sentence 47/15, 50/12, 50/23 separate 26/15 serious 13/2 SERVICE 1/1, 1/4, 3/12, 3/18, 3/21, 4/4, 4/25, 5/3, 5/9, 7/13, 8/7, 8/12, 9/4, 10/14, 11/1, 11/2, 11/6, 11/20, 12/25, 13/1, 14/9, 14/12, 15/5, 15/22, 16/14, 16/17, 16/21, 16/24, 20/8, 20/12, 22/25, 24/13, 27/18, 28/1, 28/2, 28/6, 28/10, 28/19, 37/12, 42/9, 43/5, 43/9, 45/15, 55/24, 56/1 service's 11/2 Services 2/4, 2/5, 9/22, 9/23, 10/17 serving 11/19 set 63/8, 63/10 setting 12/24 settlement 61/8 severe 10/21 short 14/6, 24/24 shorthand 65/7 show 26/16, 57/11 side 12/10, 62/19 sides 19/16 sign 13/19, 14/24, 21/16 signed 13/7 SIGNING 2/16, 55/11 single 11/23, 23/18 SIPPLE 2/9, 9/24, 17/14 sit 19/19, 24/7, 42/13 sites 12/22 sitting 19/18 situation 3/23, 10/18, 14/5, 18/2, 39/22, 42/10 situations 19/2, 40/7 six 5/11, 5/12, 7/13, 28/3, 32/24, 32/25, 33/7 Six 511, 511, 713, 2815, 52124, 5223, 537, 35/9, 35/9, 35/22, 36/2, 37/14, 45/14, 45/16, 45/23, 46/3, 46/14, 46/16, 47/17, 47/21, 48/20, 48/23, 50/21, 51/4, 51/15, 52/3, 52/5, 52/12, 52/14, 52/17, 52/23, 52/25, 53/2, 62/20
six-month 5/14, 6/6, 6/9, 8/6, 46/8, 48/25 size 37/15 skip 22/7 slender 21/1 small 41/12 smooth 43/11 snow 11/4 solid 41/21 solution 11/8, 12/5, 13/15, 15/7, 15/8, 15/10, 15/11, 16/19, 29/4, 29/5, 29/8, 29/20, 29/25, 42/12 sort 21/1, 41/1, 56/2 Sounds 58/11 SPADE 2/11, 27/7 speech 1/5 spreadsheet 26/22 Sprint 2/7, 2/8, 2/9, 3/12, 4/1, 5/12, 5/13, 5/16, 5/22, 7/6, 8/8, 9/7, 9/10, 9/19, 9/21, 9/23, 9/25, 10/11, 11/5, 11/19, 12/19, 13/20, 14/3, 14/18, 14/23, 17/6, 17/25, 20/2, 20/19, 21/1, 21/4, 21/10, 22/5, 25/7, 27/21, 28/12, 28/17, 30/6, 30/10, 30/13, 30/22, 31/16, 34/7, 35/23, 36/8, 36/10, 37/6, 37/9, 37/11, 37/22, 37/25, 38/1, 38/2, 40/13, 41/2, 41/3, 42/12, 43/21, 43/25, 45/12, 46/5, 46/7, 46/11, 46/17, 56/3, 57/16, 58/7, 59/3, 59/7 Sprint's 6/11, 11/13, 17/4, 18/5, 21/21, 21/25, 30/17, 31/22, 41/6, 47/2, 55/19 stab 39/19

Staff 9/14, 10/12, 19/7, 25/18, 26/22, 34/24, 40/24, 53/25, 54/10, 54/11, 56/12, 56/24, 61/8, 62/2, 62/9 Staff's 10/2, 26/18, 31/23, 50/10, 56/13, 57/17, 57/19, 60/21 staffed 23/16 stand 22/21, 54/13 standard 18/16, 18/20, 18/24, 19/14, 19/21, 41/25 standing 51/19 stands 53/22 stapled 49/17 start 15/6 started 23/24 starting 32/23 starts 6/11, 49/17 state 3/21, 7/24, 13/2, 19/1, 22/24, 23/24, 27/15, 27/23, 28/21, 29/12, 29/19, 29/21, 29/23, 30/14, 30/19, 31/2, 33/6, 35/19, 37/16, 65/3 state-of-the-art 23/14 statement 19/3, 50/19 states 28/20, 48/5 status 10/9 statute 55/9 stay 55/8 stayed 3/15 STEVIE 2/16 stop 16/12, 39/21 straight 5/18, 6/1 strict 40/5 strikes 53/23, 58/20 strong 13/16, 13/23 subcontractor 28/16, 29/14 subject 20/7, 20/9, 35/25, 43/15 submission 1/4 submitted 11/22, 22/22, 62/8 success 18/4 successful 44/2 SUE 2/13, 22/12, 22/15 suggestion 54/10 summary 30/15, 31/23 superior 23/5 support 38/18, 39/7, 56/25 supported 12/8, 58/16, 60/5 supporting 56/12 supportive 56/13 SUSAN 1/16 suspect 57/9, 57/12 suspend 48/6, 51/22 System 1/8, 39/7, 61/5

three-hour 59/5 three-year 3/12 thrown 10/21 Thursday 4/12, 60/19 tied 30/12, 30/24 tight 10/23 TIME 1/19, 4/7, 4/9, 4/13, 4/23, 4/24, 5/25, 7/4, 7/11, 9/13, 10/19, 10/23, 11/1, 13/8, 14/7, 21/16, 30/15, 31/3, 31/7, 32/4, 32/6, 32/19, 38/11, 38/24, 40/8, 41/5, 42/22, 42/25, 45/10, 46/1, 47/18, 49/12, 52/19, 58/2, 59/3, 59/4, 59/5, 59/6, 59/7, 60/15, 61/11, 62/3, 62/6, 63/9, 63/16, 65/7 times 12/22, 44/1 tougher 55/16 traffic 30/16, 30/21, 31/2, 34/4, 34/8, 34/12, 34/17, 39/8 training 12/23 transactions 12/24 TRANSCRIPT 1/10, 1/11 transition 11/1, 11/3, 11/23, 14/7, 14/8, 14/17, 17/8, 27/22, 29/17, 43/11 transitioning 14/11, 17/10 transitions 46/8 translated 65/8 treated 20/2, 20/25, 43/20 true 28/14, 32/20, 46/18, 47/12, 65/9 true-up 40/16, 41/4 TTY 28/9 TUDOR 2/2 Tuesday 1/18, 60/25, 61/14, 62/13 twelve 35/10 two 14/7, 15/17, 35/7, 43/16, 53/8, 59/6 type 41/4, 59/12

U

uncertainty 10/21 uncomfortable 58/14 undermine 16/22 unfortunate 11/24, 25/17, 26/9 unilaterally 48/6, 51/22 unwilling 38/16 up-front 21/22, 38/17, 39/1 upheld 12/16 urge 13/14, 15/20 users 13/1, 22/23, 23/21 utilize 12/6, 13/21

V

vacuum 10/15 validity 35/22 vendor 20/9, 20/12, 41/16 VERSIONS 1/10 view 44/14, 56/11, 57/7, 57/9 Vista 28/16 vote 47/2 voted 15/25

W

walk 25/24, 25/25, 30/9 week 18/8, 18/18, 59/14, 60/17 week's 58/2, 60/14, 62/6 weight 20/4 whim 35/21 willing 24/7, 41/10, 51/20, 59/25 win 19/15, 45/1, 45/20 window 46/20 wins 46/4 wish 58/17 withdrawn 58/5 word 4/22, 52/13 words 52/12 worked 19/7, 19/10 working 59/3, 60/11, 61/9 WorldCom 27/6, 27/7, 28/12, 29/11, 29/25, 42/7, 42/14, 59/4 worries 54/24 write 51/17 written 20/15, 48/8 wrong 62/19

Y

year 31/16, 31/17, 31/20, 31/25, 32/11, 32/12, 32/13, 45/18, 47/19
years 10/20

787

table 40/9, 42/19, 47/4 talk 18/14, 21/11, 21/12, 21/13, 40/25, 53/25 talked 27/21, 28/12, 59/18, 61/19 talking 4/22, 54/14 Tallahassee 1/22 tariff 61/7 technical 23/5 technology 28/15 TECO 61/1, 61/4, 62/16, 63/11 Telecommunications 1/7, 28/9 ten 10/20 ten-minute 24/22 tentative 51/17 term 47/17, 47/18, 48/16, 49/1, 50/21, 51/3, 51/15 terminate 35/9, 46/22, 48/6, 48/19, 48/23, 51/22, 52/2, 53/2, 53/14 terminated 46/23 Termination 6/21, 6/22, 7/6, 7/10, 7/12, 7/15, 11/16, 14/21, 28/24, 30/7, 30/12, 30/24, 35/2, 35/4, 35/8, 37/19, 37/23, 38/1, 39/4, 40/14, 40/16, 40/19, 41/4, 41/8, 41/12, 43/9, 46/20, 46/25, 47/3, 49/2, 49/6, 50/4, 50/8, 50/16, 52/4, 52/8, 53/7 terms 15/1, 18/2, 20/20, 26/18, 42/14, 44/15, 50/25, 52/25, 53/1, 56/1, 57/25 **TERRY 1/16** test 19/3 TESTIMONY 1/12 Thank 9/17, 17/21, 22/11, 24/19, 25/3, 27/3, 30/1, 30/3, 37/17, 63/2 Thanks 22/5 their's 9/7 theirs 8/7 theory 15/17 Thereupon 64/1 they've 5/10, 8/18 third 14/16 three 3/7, 3/8, 8/11, 8/14, 9/9, 14/5, 15/17, 23/22, 35/16, 43/3, 44/1, 44/9, 45/5, 45/9, 51/13, 53/8, 58/22, 58/24